DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 156 320 PS 009 947

TITLE	An Evaluation of the New York State Adoption Exchange. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Welfare Research, Inc., Albany, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	New York State Dept. of Social Services, Albany.
PUB DATE	Jan 76
NOTE	92p.; Some parts of the document may be marginally legible
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adoption; *Agency Role; Child Advocacy; Evaluation Methods; Family Role; Individual Characteristics; *Information Networks; Interagency Coordination; *Program Evaluation; Social Services; *State Programs; Surveys; Welfare Problems
IDENTIFIERS	*New York; *New York State Adoption Exchange

ABSTRACT

This paper describes a project designed to evaluate the New York State Adoption Exchange, a program providing information on adoptable children and families approved for adoption across the state of New York. The first section of the paper describes the rationale for the development of the evaluation project. The second section traces the problems of the Adoption Exchange from its inception as a voluntary program in the 1950's to the present compulsory exchange system. The next four sections of the paper present the objectives, methodology, findings, and implications of the evaluation project. Utilizing primarily surveys of agencies and citizens involved in the adoption process, the project's findings emphasize the inadequacy of the current exchange. The findings highlight the problem of placing the school-aged, Black, or seriously handicapped children who represent the majority of children listed. Recommendations from the project emphasize the need for recruiting families who are willing to accept these children. The project also emphasizes the need for increased interagency communication, increased communication between adoptive parent organizations and social service agencies, more skilled staff, and a more workable information system. The paper includes tables and appendices illustrating various aspects of the exchange program and the evaluation project. (BD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED156320

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AN EVALUATION

OF THE

NEW YORK STATE

ADOPTION EXCHANGE

FINAL REPORT
January 1976

Project Director	Hanna Grossman
Senior Research Associate	Doree Epstein
Research Assistant	Anne Nelson
Support Staff	Barbara Kaufman
	Barbara Johnson

This document is the Final Report of the Evaluation of the New York State Adoption Exchange Project, a one-year research project funded by the New York State Department of Social Services, granted to Welfare Research, Incorporated.

The opinions expressed herein are based on the author's interpretations of Project findings and do not necessarily reflect the views of the granting agency.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Virginia Hayes Sibbison

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

WELFARE RESEARCH, INCORPORATED
112 State Street, Albany, New York 12207
(518) 474-6338

VIRGINIA HAYES SIBBISON, PhD
Executive Director

Welfare Research Incorporated

PS 009417

Welfare Research, Incorporated (WRI) is a not-for-profit corporation providing research, development and evaluation skills and related consultant and contractual services to public and private agencies in the human services field.

Established in 1967, the WRI organization has continuously expanded its research and contractual capabilities and presently offers a diversified range of services to governmental agencies, as well as private foundations, commissions and professional and voluntary associations. Examples of current contract involvements include social policy analyses; fiscal and program management analyses; system design; and research, demonstration, evaluation, and training activities related to children and family services, health systems, income maintenance and medical assistance, energy, employment, human services planning, and special needs populations.

WRI's full-time professional and administrative staff have direct responsibility to a corporate Board of Directors. This Board is composed of individuals who are representative of the agencies and organizations served by WRI.

Corporate headquarters are located at:

112 State Street
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 474-6338

with a branch office in New York City at:

99 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10016
(212) 867-0630

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Summary	1
Project Rationale	5
History of the New York State Adoption Exchange	6
Project Objectives	11
Project Methodology	12
Findings	15
Implications	44
Appendices	45

List of Tables

1.	Children Ready for Placement by Age and Race	9
2.	Number of Placements Accredited to the Exchange	10
3.	Usefulness of Adoption Exchange	16
4.	Ways in Which the Exchange has been Useful	17
5.	Problems with the New York State Adoption Exchange	20
6.	Experience Regarding Communications with other Agencies	21
7.	Reasons for Unproductive Communications	22
8.	Suggested Criteria for Permanently Not Placeable Category	24
9.	Suggested Criteria for Temporarily Not Placeable Category	25
10.	Characteristics of other Exchanges and Listing Services	40
11.	Comparative Data on Selected Adoption Exchange's or Listing Services	41

SUMMARY

The New York State Adoption Exchange was a program of the Department of Social Services Children's Bureau. In New York State, as in many others, a voluntary adoption exchange function had been performed by the State Department of Social Services staff for many years.

In the late 1960's, as the number of white babies available for adoption began to decrease, attention was increasingly placed on the possibility of adoption for older children and non-white children. Part of the stimulus for this change was the activity of groups of adoptive parents and of families who wished to adopt. In New York as elsewhere, these groups found that the non-white and other waiting children were often not legally freed, nor made available for adoption by white families. In 1971 the New York State Abortion Law was passed, further reducing the number of available infants. The groups, responding both to their own desire to parent children and to their awareness that children were being deprived of the opportunity for permanence, urged changes in adoption law and practice.

One of the changes urged was a more extensive exchange mechanism. A compulsory statewide Exchange was enacted in the Spring of 1971. This required listing with the State Department every child who was legally freed for six months but for whom no home had been found, and every family approved for adoption for six months with whom no child had been placed.

The Department implemented this law by acquiring and installing a system of computer programs which had been developed for the same purpose in Californina. This system required detailed data to be listed for each family and child registered, and provided for computer listing the registrations. The computer generated referrals of parent to child and child to parent through a program for matching children to families.

Dissatisfaction with this approach preceded its becoming operational, since there were substantial delays (until November 1972) in implementing the new system, and the existing state listing system had been scrapped in December 1971. By the time the new system was operational there was insufficient field capacity to explain it to agencies across the state.

Once the system was working other problems appeared. There was little match between the children registered (largely older, non-white, and handicapped) and the families registered, most of whom wanted healthy white babies and toddlers.

In January 1975, 960 (48%) children were listed as "ready for placement" out of a total of 1,997 listed.[1] Of this 960, 901 (94%; N=960) were over five years of age; 611 (64%; N=960) were Black; and many were hard-to-place because of handicaps or a requirement that they be placed in sibling groups. Of the 1,346 families listed at this time 1,262 (94%; N=1,346) would accept only a white child under 4 without a handicap. Only 62 (5%; N=1,346) families were interested in adopting a Black child.

More than half of all children registered were classified "permanently not placeable" or "Temporarily not placeable." As there were no guide-

[1]The other 1,037 children were listed as "permanently" or "temporarily not placeable."

lines for these categories, agencies varied in using them, and concern spread that children were in many cases being classified inappropriately.

Initial technical difficulties with the actual operation of the computer programs were never fully overcome and resulted in further disappointment with the system. For all these reasons, the Exchange has been credited with very few placements (87 since its inception).

The parent groups began to believe that computer generated referrals based on this kind of matching program could not be helpful and that a picture listing of waiting children (on the model of a realtor's book of properties) was the system of choice to replace the Exchange. One parent group, the Rochester Council of Adoptive Parents (CAP), had initiated such a picture book in 1972. During 1974 and 1975 CAP was receiving state financial assistance and encouragement to expand this service on a voluntary basis.

In early 1975, The State Adoption Exchange Project was funded by a grant to Welfare Research, Incorporated under Section IV-B of the Social Security Act. The Adoption Exchange Project was designed to examine the State Adoption Exchange, determine how it could be improved, and what should replace the Exchange if improvement was not feasible.

Also in the first part of 1975 interested parent groups had been lobbying for legislation mandating a picture listing system and such a bill was passed and signed into law in the Summer of 1975, to become effective in April, 1976.

With the signing of the picture listing legislation the goal of the Project was refocused to direct its attention to those factors that would affect the success of a mandatory picture listing system. The Project was also charged with preparing the data from which conclusions leading to implementation decisions could be drawn.

The findings and recommendations of the Project are based on five components of the study:

1. A mail survey of all New York State agencies with adoption services. Questionnaires were sent to 132 public and voluntary agencies and answered by 105.

2. A telephone survey of agency handling of a sample of computer generated referrals. This examined the 113 matches made by the Exchange in April, 1975 in detail.

3. A questionnaire survey of 16 citizen groups in the state to obtain detailed information on their knowledge and criticism of the Exchange, and their suggestions for its improvement.

4. A questionnaire survey, followed by telephone and personal interviews, of 15 Exchanges and Listing Services in other states or areas.

5. A detailed examination of the in-office and data processing procedures used by the Exchange.

Significant Findings and Conclusions about the Adoption Exchange

1. The Exchange has been considered a failure by those expecting its creation to result in large numbers of placements of waiting children with waiting parents. This has not occurred. Fewer than 5% (N=1,346) of the listed families were interested in most of the children listed. Fewer than 5% (N=1,997) of the registered children were placed as a direct result of Exchange operations. The approved families who were waiting throughout the state simply were not resources for the children who were waiting.

2. Some disappointment with the Exchange was based on the unrealistic expectation that this tool would solve many problems. In the survey of sixteen different citizen groups, concern was expressed about a variety of adoption-related problems (for example, agency accountability with regard to making children available for adoption) as well as about the operation of the Exchange. The groups did not always distinguish among these concerns.

A February 1975 statement by the Citizen's Coalition for Children, an umbrella group of those surveyed, stressed that the Exchange has not been an active problem seeking and solving service and that problems have been allowed to remain unsolved. These broader expectations could not and cannot be met by any exchange or any other single tool.

3. The Exchange was perceived as a failure by even those adoption workers who understood its limited capacity to place children, because they found communication unsatisfactory.

The survey of agencies documented the impression that they did not find the Exchange useful -- only 34% of the 105 responding agencies indicated it was useful or sometimes useful; the remaining agencies were wholly negative. The most frequently mentioned reasons given why the Exchange was not useful were: 1) inappropriateness of referrals (48%; N=105) ; 2) lateness of referrals (35%; N=105); and, 3) other problems of communication between the Exchange office and the agency.

These complaints appear valid. An examination of agency handling of referrals was conducted, based on 113 computer generated matches sent out in April of this year. Findings indicate that 75 (66%; N=113) were useless because one or both parties were no longer waiting for adoption. Furthermore, 25 (66%; N=38) of the small group of referrals where this was not a problem were considered inappropriate. While one month may not be wholly representative, it is certainly indicative of the scale of the problem.

Some supervisors indicated doubt that a child could be adequately described by a computer printout, or said that the information collected

on the forms (focusing primarily upon physical rather than behavioral description) was not needed to make even initial placement decisions. Agency workers indicated that they found communication through forms and printouts, collecting irrelevant data, and passing on out-of-date material irritating.

4. Adoption workers are often isolated in their agencies and far from others doing comparable work. They want and need the opportunity to discuss adoption issues with colleagues and with a central source of information. This was not provided by the Exchange.

Examination of 15 other states' Exchanges or Picture Listing systems (carried out through a questionnaire, correspondence, telephone calls and site visits) showed an awareness of this need. Staff in most of the 15 programs stressed the need to supplement the Listing Service with more general information and technical assistance to agencies. This was particularly true in the seven states where the population of children appears to closely resemble the foster care population in New York State; and hence the system faces similar problems in placing those youngsters.

Virginia's Exchange staff stressed the benefit of participation in regional adoption meetings. Massachusetts and Illinois staffs regularly call regional meetings in which they discuss problems on the placement of listed children and general topics. In Michigan the absence of a field capacity to conduct this type of forum was seen as limiting the number of children who were being picture listed and the usefulness of the listing.

An Exchange system or a Picture Listing requires fairly continuous communication between the center and each participating agency. Informatic is likely to be more punctual and accurate if the agency receives specific services and benefits such as quick answers to technical questions. The New York Exchange was never able to provide such service.

5. The Exchange did not perform even as well as such a limited system could, in part because of insufficient support within the Department. Originally the task of developing and implementing the Exchange was taken on without any additional staffing in the adoption section. Field staff should have been available to explain the new program and to encourage adequate levels of compliance; such staff were never available. A complete system imported from California did not permit tailoring to New York agency concerns. Yet another problem was that this California-developed system used a computer language not in use in the Department: many aspects of the system were insufficiently documented. Thus original technical flaws were never entirely overcome. The support within the Bureau of Data Processing (BDP) which was needed by the Exchange was also insufficient so that schedules were often not met.

The major implications of these findings are:

1. That an Exchange or Listing Service must effectively recruit families which are probable sources of adoptive homes for

the types of children currently available. It is not sensible to maintain a system in which the bulk of the families are seeking types of children who are not available.

2. That the objectives, tasks, and reasonable outcomes for an Exchange or Listing Service must be clearly specified so that unrealistic expectations are not held by those who can profit from its use.

3. That there must be continuous exchange of communication between the Exchange or Listing Service, and the agencies/facilities with which it interacts. An open dialogue will encourage the development of an adoption system in which the agency representatives and the Exchange staff cooperate to increase the overall efficiency of the State's adoption efforts.

4. That adequate staffing is needed both to provide the technical assistance which the field workers require, and to encourage a sense of cooperative, shared involvement on the part of agency workers.

PROJECT RATIONALE

The Adoption Exchange Project was funded as a demonstration project to be carried out by Welfare Research, Incorporated. Its rationale was primarily the widespread feeling that the Exchange was not living up to expectations or justifying its costs. Its objectives were to find the procedures, data elements, and aspects of program design which might be changed to improve its functioning.

The planned analysis of the Exchange included:

- state of the art in other states
- detailed criticism by parent groups
- experience of all New York agencies
- actual agency handling of a sample of computer generated referrals
- procedures and forms for providing information to the Exchange
- office procedures in Exchange Center
- computer programs for listing children, families, matching them, and updating files.

It was originally assumed that changes might be needed in any of the forms, programs and procedures examined and that those changes would be made during the first six months of the Project. Based on the success of such changes the Project would recommend the maintenance of the Exchange or its replacement by some other system.

The Project began in May, 1975. In July the legislature passed a measure repealing the Exchange law and replacing it with a mandatory picture listing of waiting children, effective April 1, 1976. (See Appendix A).[1]

Though this law may not legally prevent the continuation of the computerized Exchange, it does require an entirely different system and makes unlikely the continued availability of resources for the Exchange. Thus, from the beginning of September the Project was reoriented to identifying those factors which would be relevant to the success of the new approach. In addition the Project was charged with preparing the data on such issues as the cost factors for different systems of printing, the effectiveness of providing the service directly or through purchase, centrally or regionally. This data was expected to facilitate necessary implementation decisions.

At the time of the reorientation, the initial surveys (listed on page 2) had already been completed and were being analyzed. Work was under way on examining the steps in communication between agencies and the Exchange Center, the Exchange Center and Data Processing, and the actual procedures and programs used in Data Processing.

With the reorientation, certain aspects of the examination achieved increased importance, and others were reduced.

The specific computer programs and procedures, which would be dropped entirely, no longer merited detailed examination. On the other hand, the questions of the usefulness of computer data handling in general, and problems of an operating program relating to a data processing bureau, remain of concern.

Among the issues which remain of at least equal concern is that of inter-agency communication, as this will be vital in any scheme for providing adoption resources from one agency to children in the care of another. Communication between agencies and the Exchange Center (or Listing Service) continues to be a crucial issue, and lessons learned from the Exchange are applicable.

This report deals with all aspects of the examination of the Exchange undertaken under the original Project plan; the discussion and analysis are focused toward the demands of the new system.

HISTORY OF THE NEW YORK STATE ADOPTION EXCHANGE

The State Department of Social Services has the general responsibility for assisting local Departments of Social Services to serve children in their care. One way the Department carries out this responsibility is by encouraging the movement of children in foster care into adoptive homes.

---

[1]Social Services Law, Section 372-b; Chapter 702 of the laws of 1975.

Generally, adoption is seen as being preferable to long term foster care. The Department of Social Services also has a fiscal responsibility to the taxpayers to encourage adoption since the costs of adoption, even when subsidized, are considerably less than keeping a child in long-term foster care. The Department does not, however, have direct responsibility for the adoption process. The local districts arrange adoptions and are supervised by the State Department of Social Services. A number of programs have been developed by the Department to facilitate and encourage the adoption of children. One of the main programs has been the State Adoption Exchange.

The Exchange replaced a function earlier carried out by regional office adoption consultants; when these regional offices were closed, central state staff provided an exchange service. These early exchange services (in the 1950's and 1960's) were largely voluntary. Local agencies informed State staff of children in need of adoptive placement who could or should not be placed locally, and of approved families for whom children had not yet been located. The state staff person (whether regional or central) thus was in a position to act as a broker who could inform localities as to where they might locate a family or child they needed. In addition, area meetings were used as an exchange forum. As field staff decreased, this service was reduced to a centrally produced list mailed out every two months. The local agencies used this assistance and the State exercised little control over whether placement was effectuated, etc. The most frequent occasion for the use of this service probably was the case in which it was considered undesirable to place the child in his own community where confidentiality would be hard to assure.

As mentioned in the Summary section, there was increased attention in the late 1960's to the possibility of adoption for older and non-white children. With the reduction in numbers of white babies needing adoption, groups of families who wished to adopt helped direct attention to the other waiting children.

These parent groups urged changing the voluntary listing practiced by the state to a compulsory system, covering all waiting children. Also contributing to the demand for mandated listing was the frustration of agency workers who had approved families for whom they could locate no children. Many workers suspected that other agencies were horading readily placeable children.

As a result of these opinions, desires and suspicions, a compulsory statewide Exchange was enacted by law in 1971.[2] The law required that

---

[2]Section 372-b of the New York State Social Services Law reads:

Statewide Adoption Exchange

1. There shall be established in the Department a statewide adoption

the State Department be informed about all waiting children and families. The legislation did not spell out how the State Department would utilize this information to increase the numbers of adoptions.

It was clear that the simple approach previously used would not work when the numbers of children listed reached thousands. The State Department decided to handle this problem by acquiring a system of computer programs which had recently been developed and used for this purpose in California. This system required detailed data to be listed for each family and child registered, and provided for computer listing the registrations. The computer then generated referrals of parent to child and child to parent through a program for matching children's characteristics to those which the families would accept.

From the beginning this approach presented difficulties. First, getting the system up and running took far longer than had been anticipated. The voluntary State listing program was dropped in December 1971, but difficulties in the Bureau of Data Processing (BDP) delayed the Exchange another eleven months. It was November 1972 before the first referrals could be mailed out. During the interval no service existed, and the communication channels eroded.

---

exchange which shall serve all authorized agencies in the state as a means of identifying possible adoptive homes on a statewide basis for children who are not placed in their own communities, and also to broaden the opportunities for prospective adoptive parents to have children placed with them.

2. The Board or the Department shall promulagate rules and regulations respectively, providing uniform procedures and forms for the operation of such adoption exchange. Such rules and regulations shall be designed to encourage all authorized agencies in the state to make adoption available for every child for whom this would be appropriate and to ensure that participating agencies adopt and maintain enlightened adoption policies and standards.

3. Each authorized agency shall refer to the adoption exchange each child in its care who has been legally freed for adoption, but who, nevertheless has remained in a foster family home, agency boarding home, group home or institution, or any combination thereof, for a period of six months or more. Each authorized applicant who has been approved as a prospective adoptive parent but who has not had a child placed with him for a period of at least six months following such approval. Each authorized agency may voluntarily refer any child or adoption applicant to the adoption exchange.

Second, there were not enough staff resources and field capacity for training to overcome the negative effect of the service interruption and of the resistance to the use of computer printouts. The Department did not allocate any additional staff to implement the new Exchange. There was initially only one person to be responsible for the Exchange as well as all other adoption matters.

Third, because the system was imported whole from California there was minimal opportunity to consult New York State practitioners regarding what items of information and procedures they would find useful.

A more serious problem appeared as soon as the system was running. There were fewer matches than expected between the registered children (largely older, non-white, and handicapped) and the registered families who largely wanted healthy white babies and toddlers.

In January, 1975, only 59 (6%) of the 960 children listed as ready for placement were under 5 years of age, and only 25 of these were white. (Table 1) At this time there were 1,346 approved families registered with the Exchange. Ninety-four percent (94%; N=1,262) of these families were white and preferred a white child under 4 years old without a handicap; and of this group 719 (53%) preferred a child under one year old. Only 62 (5%) families were interested in adopting a Black child.

TABLE 1

Children Ready for Placement by Age and Race

January 1975

Age	White	White/ Black	White/ Puerto Rican	Black/ Puerto Rican	Black	Other	Total
Under 5	25	6	1	0	25	2	59
5 - 10	68	21	9	7	312	7	424
11+	143	32	9	2	274	17	477
Total	236	59	19	9	611	26	960

While it is difficult to provide statistics on handicaps by age, the children listed on the Exchange are those who have not been placed during the six months since legal freeing. Therefore, it can be assumed that the younger children listed on the Exchange have some handicaps which make them difficult to place. When the Exchange receives a registration for a child

who is easily placeable, the Exchange Coordinator informs the registering agency of available family resources so that the child never is registered.

Another indication of the lack of matching between families and children is to be found in the small number of families to whom referrals were sent. During the last year computer generated referrals have been sent out for an average of 47 families each month. This shows that only 3.5% (N=1,346) of the registered families are a resource for the children listed on the Exchange. Since many of the same families receive referrals every time, the actual number of homes which are possible placements for children is even smaller.

Many agencies received no referrals for the children and families they had registered. There was difficulty in getting agencies to notify the Exchange when placements were made; as a result, referrals were frequently sent out for families or children who should have been withdrawn.

More than half of all children registered were classified permanently or temporarily not placeable. No guidelines were issued for the use of these categories, and agencies varied considerably in how they classified children. This reduced the number of placements the Exchange could facilitate.

Initial technical difficulties resulting from the actual operation of the computer programs were hard to overcome and resulted in further disappointment with the system.

The Exchange has been credited with very few placements, for all of the reasons cited above. (Table 2 illustrates the number of placements accredited since the Exchange began).

TABLE 2

Number of Placements Accredited to the Exchange

Year	Number of Adoptive Placements
1972	none reported
1973	24
1974	39
1975 (through August)	24
Total	87

The citizen groups in New York State have had a continuing concern about the New York State Exchange. They helped provide the impetus to get the legislation passed that set up the Exchange, and when problems with the Exchange surfaced they were a vocal group for immediate change.

In July 1973, 11 foster and adoptive parent groups sent a memorandum to the Department of Social Services outlining their concerns about the Exchange (Appendix B). In the fall of 1973 the newly formed New York Citizen's Coalition for Children sent out a questionnaire to 153 adoption agencies and received answers from 46 agencies. This material was analyzed, and the Coalition found that the perceptions (about the Adoption Exchange) of those responding were almost uniformly negative. The parent groups came to believe that a listing of waiting children with pictures and descriptions from which parents could make their own choices would be preferable to any matching system, computerized or not.

The general dissatisfaction, and the criticism of the parent's groups (particularly the Citizen's Coalition for Children) led to the design of the State Adoption Exchange Project. This research effort was funded through Welfare Research, Incorporated by a grant under Section IV-B of the Social Security Act; its objectives were to examine the Exchange, whether and how it might be improved, and if not, what should replace it.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

After the passage of the new Listing Service legislation, the Project continued in order to gather facts that could be used to aid in developing a viable new system.

The following objectives were established:

1. Assess Adoption Workers' Experiences with and Attitudes Toward the Exchange.
   - Document the degree to which workers liked or disliked the Exchange.
   - Define positive as well as negative aspects of the Exchange.
   - Obtain constructive criticism and ideas for a better system.
   - Encourage agency communication and involvement with the Exchange Project staff.

2. Assess Agencies' Use of Computer Generated Referrals (CGR).
   - Determine how agencies use computer generated referrals.
   - Assess inter-agency communication and cooperation in reference to CGR's.
   - Determine appropriateness and timeliness of referrals.
   - Identify barriers to inter-agency placements.

3. Assess Citizen Groups Complaints About the Exchange.
   - Document citizen groups complaints.
   - Encourage citizen group involvement in planning process.

4. Observe and Evaluate the Exchange's In-Office Procedures.
   - Determine how the Exchange computer system worked.
   - Determine which in-office procedures need improvement and which were good.

5. Assess Other States' Exchanges or Listing Services.
   - Gain new ideas.
   - Compare other state services with New York's.

PROJECT METHODOLOGY

The New York State Adoption Exchange Project included five major components, each with a different methodology. The components were:

1. A survey of New York agencies with adoption services.

2. A survey of agencies' handling of a sample of computer generated referrals.

3. A survey of adoption citizen groups.

4. An examination of in-office and data processing procedures used by the Adoption Exchange.

5. A survey of other states' Exchanges and/or Listing Services.

1. Agency Perception of State Adoption Exchange

In June, 1975, an open-ended mail questionnaire was sent to the New York State 58 public and 74 private agencies known to have adoption programs. The purpose of the questionnaire was to explore each agency's experience with the New York State Adoption Exchange. Both positive and negative experiences with the Exchange were explored. The area of communications among agencies in relation to the Exchange's computer generated referrals was also covered. The questionnaire asked respondents to suggest criteria for classification of "temporarily not placeable" and "permanently not placeable" children (A copy of the mail questionnaire in Appendix C).

Four weeks after the questionnaire was mailed a follow-up letter was sent to each agency that had not responded. In the meantime the Project staff was in touch with many of the agencies and encouraged them to send in the questionnaires.

The open-ended questionnaire allowed numerous responses to each question. This was helpful for getting candid responses, but made coding more difficult since categories had to be developed after some questionnaires were collected. Almost fifty questionnaires were collected before categories for coding the data were developed. After all the questionnaires were collected some coding categories were expanded while others were collapsed.

Since the questionnaire was open-ended, the responses tended to be scattered. This necessitated coding of the entire questionnaire at once to insure that no responses were neglected nor coded more than once.

Once the coding scheme was developed, each response was tallied and totals were made for each category. Percentages for each question were based on the total number of agencies responding to the questionnaire (rather than to the individual question, because of the scattering of responses). Since many agencies responded with several comments while some gave none, the percentages didn't always add to 100 percent.

2. Agency Response to Exchange Computer Generated Referrals

Criticism of the Exchange has included statements that referrals were inappropriate, that agencies paid no attention to the referrals, and that agencies did not utilize the referrals. In addition, experience with other mechanisms for making inter-agency placements had shown that communication between agencies is frequently slow and cumbersome.

Thus the original Exchange Project design included a plan to select and closely monitor a sample of computer generated referrals in order to identify barriers to the effective use of such referrals.

The extent to which this task was accomplished was limited by two factors. The first was that at the time of the initiation of the Project the computer program had not been run for two months and it appeared that the next referrals would be delayed. As a consequence, it was necessary to use the last 113 matched referrals (generated in April) as the sample in order to meet the Project time schedule. This affected the kind of data it was possible to obtain. Because two to three months had passed since the referrals were sent out, it was possible to determine which had gone to placement, but it was difficult to obtain detailed retrospective information on the nature of the communication process between agencies. The list which was compiled of all computer generated referrals mailed out by the Exchange at the end of April included two hundred and twenty-six referrals, including 113 child-family matchings.[3] Forty-five agencies which had received referrals for 47 families and 55 children, were surveyed.

---

[3]The computer generated more referrals but substantial numbers had not been sent for one of three reasons:

A. Either child or family had been withdrawn to the knowledge of the Exchange personnel but the withdrawal had not been entered into the computer file prior to the matching run.

B. The number of referrals generated for a particular family was considered excessive. In at least one case, for a family apparently willing to take a wide spectrum of children, a dozen referrals were sent, but an even larger number had been generated.

During July each agency having either children or families (or both) involved in these referrals was called on the telephone (by one of three Project staff), and the worker responsible for the child or family was asked a series of questions about this referral and Exchange referrals in general (see Appendix D). Most information was obtained from open-ended questioning.[4] Analysis of these interviews was in terms of the success of the referral in producing a placement; the timeliness and appropriateness of the referral; the quality of the inter-agency communicatio and general comments on the Exchange offered by respondents.

3. Citizen Group Survey

In June, 1975 the Project staff sent questionnaires to listed officers of 16 parent groups in New York State (see Appendix E). This questionnaire attempted to determine the group's experience with the Exchange in terms of their parent members. It also asked about awareness of technical problems with the Exchange and for suggestions for improvements.

Eight groups' officers answered the questionnaire. Four other groups' officers were contacted by telephone and stated that they had nothing to add to the Citizen Coalition for Children statement of February, 1975. This position paper and a 1973 memorandum (see Appendix B) was given to the Project staff by the Citizens Coalition for Children. The 1975 Position Paper was particularly critical of the Exchange as a problem solving service. The circulation of the Position Paper was limited to the member groups.

C. The referral was inappropriate within the terms of the registration material listed for family and child, i.e. a family who would not accept a retarded child was referred for one who was listed as retarded.

[4]It is generally recognized that information obtained by open-ended questioning is variable in relation to the experience of the interviewers and degree of cooperation of the respondent. In addition, because of the passage of time some workers did not recollect much detail. In some cases changes in personnel made it difficult to obtain detailed information.

4. In-Office Procedures

Participant observation was used to assess and evaluate in-office and data processing procedures. A Project staff person participated in part of the operation of the Exchange, especially dealing with the data processing aspects, and in-office handling of Exchange forms and computer printouts. This person spent five months (on a full time basis) in the Exchange office.

5. Other State Adoption Exchanges

In order to put the success or failure of the New York State Adoption Exchange into context, a brief examination of other state exchanges was undertaken. Most of these were identified by the Adoption Resource Exchange of North America (ARENA). Some came to the attention of the Project in other ways.

A total of twenty state exchanges were identified as possible contacts. Of this number it was possible to obtain information from fifteen. The information was obtained through combinations of an open-ended questionnaire (see Appendix F), letters, telephone calls and site visits. The names and titles of informants are also found in Appendix F. Additional information was obtained from two listing services within New York State: the New York City Adoption Exchange Book and the CAP (Council of Adoptive Parents) Book, Incorporated; and from the Adoption Resource Exchange of North America (ARENA).

The mail survey asked general questions about the service, such as type of service; characteristics of listed and placed children; attitudes toward the service; and success rate. Most service representatives wrote letters and sent materials instead of filling out the open-ended questionnaire. Much follow up was done, via telephone and site visits, in order to get more detailed information.

FINDINGS

Agency Perception of the State Adoption Exchange

One hundred and five (105) agencies, out of a total of 132, returned the mail questionnaires. This was an overall seventy-nine percent (79%) response rate which is considered good for a mail survey. The response rate for public agencies was ninety-three percent (93%) and sixty-nine percent (69%) for private agencies. Findings will be presented separately for public and private agencies where there was a significant difference.

The most frequent responses will be presented in narrative form and all responses will be presented in table form.

Usefulness of the Adoption Exchange

When the agencies were asked, "Has the Exchange been useful?", 47 percent (N=105) said No; 17 percent, Yes; another 17 percent said Sometimes; and 19 percent stated that they had no experience with the Exchange.

There was a marked difference in responses between the public and private agencies in terms of how useful they found the Adoption Exchange. Only 2 of 51 private agencies said that the Exchange was useful while 16 of 54 public agencies said that it was useful. It appears that the Exchange has been of more use to the public agencies than it has to the private agencies. This could relate to the fact that many of the private agencies are located in areas that have a picture listing service, or an informal Exchange mechanism, for instance, New York City and Rochester.

There was also a difference in the number of positive responses. These difference of responses are statistically significant at the .01 level based on a chi-square test.

The responses of the public and private agencies are illustrated separately in Tables 3 and 4. In subsequent tables this was not done because there was no marked difference between the two types of agencies. Table 3 illustrates the total responses to the question, "Has the Exchange been useful?"

TABLE 3

Usefulness of Adoption Exchange

Is Exchange Useful	Public Agencies	Private Agencies	Total Agencies	Percentages of Agencies (N=105)
No	22	27	49	47%
Yes	16	2	18	17
Sometimes	10	8	18	17
No Experience	6	14	20	19
TOTAL RESPONSES	54	51	105	100%

Ways in Which the Exchange is Useful

Only forty-six agencies (44%; N=105) said one or more favorable things about the Exchange. A total of 71 positive responses were tallied. The most frequently reported positive response was that the Adoption Exchange identified types of children and families that are available. Fifteen percent (N=105) of the total responding agencies indicated this item.

Several agencies mentioned that they had never had a placement through the Exchange, but they also felt that the Exchange was useful in terms of identifying the kinds of waiting children.

The second most frequent response (13%; N=105) was that the Exchange was useful in placing hard-to-place children. The third most frequent response (11%; N=105) was that the monthly list of new registrations with statistics was useful. Ten percent of the respondents reported that the Exchange did lead to some indirect placements. These agencies reported that the child or parent about whom they were calling generally had already been placed, but that by communicating with the other agency they were able to find another child or parent in place of the one originally identified.

One agency mentioned that the most important and successful use of the Exchange for her agency had been in initiating adoption with foster parents of long term foster children.

Table 4 illustrates the ways in which the agencies said the Exchange was useful.

TABLE 4

Ways in Which the Exchange Has Been Useful

Ways Useful	Public Agencies	Private Agencies	Total Agencies	Percentage of Agencies (N=105)
Identifies types of available children and parents.	11	5	16	15%
Useful for Placing Hard-to-Place Children.	10	4	14	13
Monthly New Registrations with Statistics are helpful.	10	2	12	11
Leads to Indirect Placements.	10	1	11	10
Aids in Communications with other Agencies.	5	2	7	7
Helps families find Hard-to-Place Children.	1	3	4	4
Other	7	0	7	7
TOTAL RESPONSES	54	17	71	*

* The Percentage of responses does not add to 100% because some agencies gave no responses to this item, while others made one or more responses.

There were a total of forty-five agencies giving 71 responses describing how the Exchange was useful. However 99 agencies gave a total of 248 responses describing problems with the Exchange. Five agencies gave no comment on the usefulness, one gave only positive responses, 55 gave only negative responses and 44 gave both positive and negative responses.

Problems with the Exchange

The problem mentioned most frequently, by forty-eight percent (48%) of the 105 responding agencies, was that the computer generated referrals were inappropriate[5/] and of no use to the agencies. This was followed by the response that the matches were untimely in that, by the time the agency received a computer generated referral, the child (or parent) had already been placed, or other plans had been made. Thirty-five percent (35%; N=105) of the agencies reported that this was a problem.

Several people expressed a dislike for the computer system in general. They felt that it lost the necessary personal contact needed in adoption.

5/ Types of inappropriate matches were sometimes, but not always, spelled out by the agencies. These types include the following:

A. Matches were inappropriate in terms of listed data, i.e., inseparable siblings were referred to a family who could not take siblings; religion, sex, age, skin color, etc. did not match preference.

B. Matches were inappropriate because the child's problems had been minimized and/or family's ability to accept problems had been maximized.

C. Matches were inappropriate because retardation was confused with slowness.

D. Matches were inappropriate because there was no room for describing the child's and family's characteristics, needs, etc. Sketches were generally inaccurate.

One respondent said:

> In general we have found the CAP Book and ARENA less cumbersome and more effective in placing children with adoptive families. Our use of the State Exchange is approached with less optimism, due to the very critical problems early in its development. By the time we receive printouts of potential matches, our experience has been that we have already been successful in locating a home for our child, or other agencies' families are inappropriate or have already been used.

Another worker said:

> The Exchange has not been useful in any way and analyzing the problem perhaps it is that you cannot appropriately put children on a computer printout. Further, most of us as supervisors and workers are not of the computer generation. We have a basic rejection of the computer idea for picturing children and families and therefore do not glean what information we could from the printout.

Numerous other problems with the Exchange were cited. They are presented in Table 5.

TABLE 5

Problems with the New York State Adoption Exchange

Problems	Total Responses	Percentage of Agencies (N=105)
Matches are inappropriate.	50	48%
Matches are untimely - - Child or parent already placed or other plans in progress.	37	35
Withdrawals don't get off the computer.	19	18
Printouts are difficult to read.	17	16
CAP and other Exchanges more useful.	15	14
No or few successful placements.	15	14
Other computer related problems.	14	13
Received no matches.	12	11
Agency has few hard-to-place children.	12	11
Printouts are inaccurate - - they are difficult to correct.	10	10
Too much red tape - - difficulty with forms and registrations.	9	9
Adoption problems not related to the Exchange.	7	7
Parents on file do not want children available on Exchange.	7	7
Too much emphasis on physical characteristics - need more room to describe personality.	5	5
Need more coordination.	4	4
Other	9	7
No problems	6	6
TOTAL	248	*

* The percentage of responses does not add to 100% because some agencies gave no responses to this item, while others made one or more responses.

Communications with Other Agencies

Agencies were asked what their experience had been in communicating with other agencies in relation to computer generated referrals (See Table 6). Thirty percent (30%; N=105) of the agencies felt that these communications with other agencies were unproductive. Nineteen percent (19%) felt that communications were good, and fifteen percent (15%) said that their results were mixed. These respondents generally felt that inter-personal cooperation was good, but that the contact did not result in a placement. Thirty-six percent (36%) of the agencies either did not answer this question or indicated that they had had no such experience.

TABLE 6

Experience Regarding Communications with Other Agencies

Responses	Total Agencies	Percentage of Agencies (N=105)
Unproductive	32	30%
Good	20	19
Mixed*	16	15
No Experience	28	27
No Answer	9	9
TOTAL RESPONSES	105	100%

* Most mixed feelings were due to other problems with the Exchange, rather than with inter-agency cooperation.

Sixty-two agencies, including many whose basic feeling was that their interagency communication was good, gave reasons why contacts with other agencies were unproductive. The most frequent response was that the other agency had already placed the child or other plans were already in progress. Thirty-four percent (34%; N=105) of the agencies gave this explanation. One agency worker wrote:

> In perhaps a half dozen incidents when informed of matches we wished to pursue, we found when we contacted the other agency information from the Exchange was very much outdated. In one instance when we contacted an agency we found that the child had been placed with a family from its own caseload five months earlier. There were several other incidents where in we found that although we called the particular agency about a child immediately when the information was received from the Exchange, several other agencies had already indicated a like interest, or a match was already under way.

Another agency noted that other agencies do not call them when they have an available child. They felt that this was due to past unproductive communications.

The next most common complaint was that agencies were slow in answering inquiries; ten percent (10%; N=105) of the agencies indicated this response. Table 7 presents the reasons for unproductive communications with other agencies.

TABLE 7

Reason for Unproductive Communications

Reasons	Total Responses	Percentage of Agencies (N=105)
Agencies already have other plans - children already placed.	36	34%
Agencies slow in answering inquiries	11	10
Cooperation best with agencies with whom relations have been established.	9	9
Agencies get too many referrals.	9	9
Found matches to be inappropriate after contacting other agency.	9	9
Too hard to reach proper person on telephone, too expensive.	6	6
Some agencies have rigid standards.	5	4
Some agencies do not cooperate because they do not like and/or do not use the Exchange.	5	4
Other	7	6
TOTAL	97	*

* The percentage of responses does not add to 100% because some agencies gave no responses to this item, while others made one or more responses.

Permanently and Temporarily Not Placeable Categories

The categories "temporarily not placeable" (TNP) and "permanently not placeable" (PNP) have caused problems in the use of the New York State Adoption Exchange because there are no guidelines for the criteria by which children should be classified into these categories. The law states that all children who have been legally free for six months and who have not been placed in an adoptive home must be listed with the Exchange. The Exchange now allows children to be placed into three categories: ready for placement, temporarily not placeable (TNP), and permanently not placeable (PNP). Over half of the children classified in these categories could in fact be adopted.

These categories are often used by adoption workers when they want a child to stay in a foster home. One worker discussed this problem in the following manner:

> I am in total agreement that many children are left in limbo as a result of caseworkers' opinions as to what child is or is not adoptable. I firmly believe that if a child can function in foster care he or she can function in an adoptive placement. Many caseworkers need to be re-educated to the fact that the older child is adoptable and legally entitled to permanent parents. I have encountered many who continue to cling to the idea that adoption pertains only to infants and toddlers. They should not judge all parents by their own restricted set of standards as to what they themselves could be willing to accept. I myself could not accept a multi-handicapped child, but I know that there are special people who can and they should be encouraged to do so.

One hundred and one agencies suggested criteria for, and indicated comments about the PNP category. The most frequent comment (27%; N=105) of the responding agencies was that the individual's needs, willingness, time in care, depth of relationship, etc., must be considered. The second most frequent response was that children should be classified as placeable unless the child (particularly an adolescent) does not want to move. Twenty-five percent (25%) of the agencies suggested this criterion. One worker elaborated on the need for individual assessment:

> When considering freeing a child for adoption our main interest is in what way that child would benefit. We encourage our foster parents to adopt when it is appropriate. There are some instances where even though the foster parents won't adopt, the child does not want to leave and we don't want to produce any further trauma in the child's life. Most of the time we are successful in getting foster parents to adopt or placing the child for adoption.

Several respondents (19%) felt that children should be classified ready for placement unless they had severe multiple handicaps. Another seventeen (17%) percent felt that any child who could function in a family setting was placeable.

Table 8 lists the criteria and other comments regarding the "permanently not placeable" category.

TABLE 8

Suggested Criteria for Permanently Not Placeable Category

Criteria	Total Responses	Percentage of Agencies (N=105)
Individual child's needs, willingness, time in care, etc., must be considered.	28	27%
Children are placeable unless they (especially adolescents) do not want to move.	26	25
Children are placeable unless they have severe multiple handicaps	20	19
All children are placeable; all children who can function in a family setting are placeable.	18	17
Permanently not placeable children should not be listed.	13	12
Reasons for permanently not placeable category should be indicated for each child	12	11
Children are placeable unless they need institutionalization.	11	10
Guidelines should be developed and spelled out.	7	7
Children are placeable unless they have a short life expectancy.	6	6
Decisions should be made by a panel, or doctor with caseworkers. There should be guidelines on who makes decisions.	6	6
Need periodic case evaluation by State.	4	4
Other	7	7
TOTAL RESPONSES	158	*

* The percentage of responses does not add to 100 percent because some agencies gave no response to this item, while others made one or more responses.

Only 46 agencies made comments about and/or suggested criteria for the temporarily not placeable categories. Eleven percent (11%; N=105) of the respondents felt that children who are in treatment programs which should not be interrupted should be defined as temporarily not placeable. A similar number said that such a categorization should be time limited and the reasons should be specified. Nine percent (9%) said that a child should be categorized TNP when there were legal problems involving the child, for example when the child was not legally free for adoption. Another nine percent (9%) felt that a child should be TNP until his psychological and medical evaluations were complete. Table 9 lists the criteria and other comments regarding the temporarily not placeable category.

TABLE 9

Suggested Criteria for Temporarily Not Placeable Category

Criteria	Total Responses	Percentage of Agencies (N=105)
When a child is in treatment which should not be interrupted.	12	11%
Should be time limited and specify reasons.	12	11
When there are legal problems - - child not free.	9	9
When child's medical or psychological evaluation is not complete.	9	9
When foster parents or others are considering adoption.	8	8
Do not list TNP's.	6	6
When child is emotionally unready to move but therapy is expected to overcome this.	4	4
Other	7	7
TOTAL RESPONSES	67	*

* The percentage of responses does not add to 100 percent because some agencies gave no responses to this item while others made one or more responses.

Follow-Up on the Computer Generated Referrals

Forty-five agencies were contacted in order to find out what happened as a result of the 113 matches (or 226 referrals) that were sent out in April.

Referral Success

As of July, only one placement had definitely been planned as a result of the April matches; two others were still being explored; and in one case the receipt of several matches for a handicapped child encouraged the agency to begin work with the foster family toward adoption.

Timeliness of Referrals

Two-thirds of the matches (66%; N=75) were unproductive because of untimeliness; that is, the parent or the child or both were no longer available when the referral was received.

Thirty-three children, involved in 55 matches, were not available because they had already been placed or placement had been planned. Eighteen families, involved in 33 matches, had withdrawn by the time the referral was received. There were 13 matches in which neither the children nor the families remained available.

Appropriateness of Referrals

Information about whether the referral was considered appropriate (and if not, why not) was requested regardless of whether one or the other party in the match had become unavailable. Approximately one-third (30%; N=34) of the 113 matches were defined as inappropriate. It is interesting that of the 38 matches where both parties were still available, the proportion considered inappropriate was far higher (66%; N=25). A possible reason for this is that the relatively more placeable children tended not to be available, while those still waiting were often seen as too handicapped by the families' agencies. Inappropriateness was claimed about twice as often by the family's agency as by the child's.

In most cases the decisions regarding appropriateness were made by workers solely on the basis of the printout material. Out of 17 cases in which the child was considered too handicapped for the parent (the single most frequent basis for such a decision), in only one case was this decision arrived at after inter-agency contact. These inappropriate matches indicate that there is insufficient ability to distinguish among handicapping conditions in the matching program.

The second most frequently stated reason for matches being considered inappropriate related to race. Race as the basis for the child's agency rejecting a match usually reflected a refusal to place Black children with white families. This is an agency policy which there is no way to indicate on the registration form. The family agencies considered matches inappropriate when the non-white child referred was seen as too dark. This is another judgement which cannot be made by the computer.

Communication

An attempt was made to find out whether there was direct agency communication about a match, who initiated it, whether there was response, and how far discussion progressed. The question of initiative was not very productive because memory as to who had picked up the telephone first proved quite unreliable.

Agencies generally did not initiate contact when their client was no longer available. If the other agency called, the worker would be informed of the unavailability; if they wrote, an answer might not be sent. Where agencies had decided that the match was inappropriate, the results were similar. Only 14 matches offered potential for further communication in that neither client had withdrawn, and there was no early decision that the match was inappropriate. Of these 14, according to the respondents, such communication took place in only three cases.

In order to illustrate the difficulty in communication, the problems reported by both agencies, in each of these 14 cases, are briefly described:

Case #1 - Child's agency overwhelmed with referrals from a variety of sources; parent agency has no recollection of communication.

Case #2 - Child's agency remembers no communication; parent agency says initiated contact, was told child planned for.

Case #3 - Child's agency considers child too disturbed to move; parent agency initiated contact, got no response.

Case #4 - Child's agency considers child too disturbed to move; parent agency overwhelmed with referrals, no contact.

Case #5 - Child's agency considers child too disturbed to move; parent agency initiated contact, got no response (3, 4, and 5 are same child).

Case #6 - Child's agency says referral looks good, 11 weeks after referral said they would respond; parent agency says did not receive referral.

Case #7 & #8 - Two siblings; child's agency received a lot of referrals, is handling one at a time; parent agency contact was told there were plans; four months after referral children still were not placed.

Case #9 - Parent agency wrote, sent summary, held some discussion; there are several possible families, but this match is still a possibility.

Case #10 - Neither child nor parent agency had gotten through their pile of referrals to these.

Case #11 - Child's agency says they were told parent withdrawn; parent agency says did not received referral and have had no communication.

Case #12 - Exchange of summaries; placement still possible.

Case #13 - This is the one match that led to placement.

Case #14 - Child's agency says they were told parents had withdrawn; parent agency says never received referral or communication.

Past experience, suggesting that a high proportion or referrals would be useless, reduced the agency's overall interest in following up on them. In a number of cases one or the other party to the match received a number of referrals and did not work out any effective way to set up priorities and inform the other agencies what to expect.[6]

Comment Section

General comments about the Exchange were also obtained as a result of open-ended questions asked in these telephone interviews. Forty-five agenci were intervied; 45 different comments were received from two-thirds of the agencies. In some cases several comments were made or more than one worker was interviewed and comments were combined for the agency.

The 45 comments can be characterized as follows: 10 positive, 3 neutral, and 32 negative.

Only 4 agencies limited themselves to positive comments; 4 made positive as well as negative comments; 2 made only neutral comments; and 21 were recorded only in negative comments.

The single most frequent negative comment (10 times) was that matches are untimely; the second most frequently made negative comment (7 times) was that agencies do not follow up on referrals.

---

[6]The Exchange limits the number sent out at one time to around twelve (12), even though the computer may generate many more.

Opinions of Citizen Groups

Questionnaires were sent to 16 citizen groups; eight groups responded. Some of the group officers indicated that they knew of agencies who failed to list families unless pressured, and others who failed to list children. Most said they knew of no successful computer generated referrals; one complained that referrals were limited by inappropriate criteria in the computer program and by pre-selection among matches by Exchange staff. Four additional groups' officers who did not return a questionnaire stated that they had nothing to add to the Citizen's Coalition for Children Position Paper of February, 1975.

The February 1975 Position Paper essentially says that the Exchange has not been an active problem seeking and solving service; and that as a result problems have remained unsolved. The statement touches upon the Coalition's contacts with the Exchange over the years, but makes no distinction between old problems which have been remedied, and new ones, or constant ones.

In general parent group respondents said local agencies found the Exchange hard to use and too impersonal; that there had been more useful personal contact prior to initiation of the compulsory, computerized Exchange; that computer printouts are hard to read; and that referrals are often a waste of time because they are based on out-of-date information. One felt that computer matching is inherently impossible since selection must be personal. Most said that agencies prefer the CAP Book (Council of Adoptive Parents Book) because it is easier to read and, since its use is voluntary, agencies are surer that the children are ready for placement. Parent respondents also complained that the Exchange gives parents no access for choosing children, making them dependent on referrals generated and chosen for them. These parent respondents feel that families actually would accept children with characteristics different from those for whom they are registered, and thus could be a resource for children not now referred to them.

Most respondents stated that an ideal system would use pictures and descriptions, be widely distributed for recruiting use, and be backed by strongly activist staff. Some referred to a need for accountability, in particular the ability to check whether all children who should be included on the Exchange are in fact so listed.

Some respondents do not want parents listed: some want those families who are able to take hard-to-place children listed; and some want to list all families upon completion of study and all children, even those not yet freed. Some want a listing to spell out any agency limitations by race, religion, or family composition; others want such limitations prohibited. Many called for standardized definitions of handicaps, time limitations on "temporarily not placeable", and exclusion of the "permanently not placeable" category.

Internal Programs and Procedures

The New York State Department of Social Services chose to implement Section 372-b of the Social Service Law (the establishment of a Statewide Adoption Exchange) through use of a computerized system that lists and matches adoptable children and prospective parents. This law required that any child who had been legally free six months and not placed in an aodptive home to be listed with the State Department of Social Services. Parents who had not received a child within six months of approval for adoption were also required to be listed.

Registrations, revisions, and withdrawals are sent to the Exchange office by the approximately 130 local public and private agencies. They are then keypunched and put on a computer file. Printouts of the new registrations and revisions are sent out the respective agencies so they can check their accuracy. (See example of child and family registration and updated printout in Appendix G) One copy of this printout is kept on file in the Exchange office.

Once a month, a computer matching program is run. This program takes children's characteristics and matches them against those desired by parents. It matches first in regard to race, sex, color of hair, level of intellectual abilities, handicaps, skin color, eye color, build and ethnic background. (Those parents who are willing to take the kinds of children listed generally are registered as having no preferences on many of these characteristics) If a child matches parent desires on all these characteristics, the computer goes on to match religion, age and presence of siblings. If a child and parent match on these items also, a referral is produced by the computer. This referral is merely a printout of the parent's and child's registration forms side by side on one page. (See Appendix H)

On the parent registration form agencies specify whether the family (1) prefers, (2) will accept or (3) will not consider, a certain characteristic in a child. The computer matching program does not distinguish between (1) prefers and (2) will accept.

Once the referral printouts are received in the Exchange office the staff discards those involving a family or a child who has been withdrawn, but has not yet been taken off the computer file. All referrals which duplicate those sent out the previous month are also discarded.

Families and children for whom many referrals were generated are separated out. As it is considered unrealistic to mail more than about a dozen referrals at once to an agency for one parent or child, the most promising referrals are chosen and the other discarded.

All other referrals are also screened and inappropriate matches are discarded. Descriptive material from registrations printed on the referrals, but not used by the matching program, may aid in determining appropriateness. Children with certain kinds of handicaps are screened out

if it is felt, on the basis of text or reactions to past referrals, that the parent will not accept them. This screening results in the retention of approximately one-tenth of the referrals generated by the computer, and requires approximately 5 days time of the Adoption Specialist.

A computer generated referral (CGR) code number is assigned to each remaining referral. One copy of the selected referrals is filed, one is sent to the child's agency and one to the parent's agency. Each agency is also sent a form requesting information on whether there was follow-up of the referral and what its result was. While these forms are often not returned, the Exchange has no other routine way to obtain that information or assure that referrals are follow-up.[7]

Quarterly, the computer generates extensive statistical reports on the children and families registered. Statistical reports are prepared by abstracting manually some of the data and are sent to all the agencies (See Appendix I). Over the years some changes have been made in these reports to emphasize the variables which are most significant at this time in New York State, but further changes would be required to make it fully useful. For instance, it would be valuable to have a simplified report for agencies generated directly by the computer.

Semi-annually a computer generated report is sent to each agency. This lists by name and Exchange number the children and families registered on the Exchange from that agency, and separately lists those added and those withdrawn during the preceeding six months. This provides another way for agencies to check the accuracy of the system and the completeness of their registrations.

The Exchange office sends out a manually compiled list of newly registered children each month. This list briefly describes the children and indicates which agency and worker to contact directly for further information. (See Appendix J) This service was initiated in March 1974. It was planned to be sent out later in the month than the computer generated referrals, but because of data processing difficulties it has generally been sent out earlier. To the extent that it is useful it has resulted in plans being quickly made for some of the listed children, who subsequently were matched by computer. Thus it has increased frustration with the Exchange's other procedures.

The Exchange office has also produced, at irregular intervals, a newsletter entitled "You-Me" featuring pictures and descriptions of some waiting children (See Appendix K). This is sent to agencies and other community resources such as public libraries. Various procedures have been designed from time to time to handle inquiries resulting from this exposure of the children, but these procedures have been changed often and records of inquiries have not been kept. Thus the effectiveness of this effort cannot be evaluated.

---

[7]For the referrals sent out this January and April only 59% of these forms have been returned.

Personnel Working with the Exchange

The full time staff of the Exchange consists of an Adoption Specialist and a clerk. The Adoption Specialist handles all communications with local agencies, processes and edits Exchange registrations, revisions, and withdrawals. She compiles statistics and screens all computer updates and referral printouts. She is also responsible for obtaining pictures and descriptions for the "You-Me" Newsletter. The clerk does all the typing, filing, mailing and logging in and out of Exchange materials.

In addition, personnel in the Bureau of Data Processing (BDP) work with the Exchange. A Systems Analyst has been assigned the responsibility of getting the system operating, making changes, and being a contact person for the Exchange staff. Recently, this has been approximately a half-time job, but during 1974 the Systems Analyst spent only about 20% of her time on the Exchange. Those aspects of the operation which are routinely working well and not being revised are handled by the Production Supervisor.

During most of the history of the Exchange it has been in the hands of the Systems Analyst, and few of its components have yet reached that point of stability that would justify their assignment to the Production Supervisor.

Either the Systems Analyst or the Production Supervisor arranges for key-punching through the Keypunch Supervisor. Computer operations are carried out by the Office of General Services.

Exchange Forms

The New York State Adoption Exchange is a very complicated system with many forms and sub-systems. At present there are nine different forms on which the Exchange office communicates with the agencies. These are:

D.S.S.	1564	Child Registration
D.S.S.	1565	Parent Registration
D.S.S.	1821	Report on Registrations - This summarized registrations submitted at one time
D.S.S.	1822	Report on Withdrawals - This summarized withdrawals submitted at one time
D.S.S.	1828	Withdrawal Notification
D.S.S.	2066	Initial Report on Adoption Placement of Child
D.S.S.	2067	Final Report on Adoption Placement of Child
Transmittal	II	Attached to updates sent to agencies
Transmittal	III	Attached to referrals sent to agencies and is returned by agencies with information on their follow-up

All of these forms must be edited and filed by the Exchange staff. Three of these forms are key-punched and used for the computerized matching system. Other forms are used internally:

Transmittal	I	Attached to the registrations sent to keypunch.
Transmittal	IV	Attached to withdrawals sent to keypunch.
Transmittal	V	Attached to revisions set to keypunch.
D.S.S.	2090	Card file listing each referral sent out to the agencies.

Almost every form has a separate file. In order to find out something about a particular child or parent record, it is often necessary to look in several different files. Parts of this filing system were imported with the matching program from California, and parts of it have evolved over the years in an attempt to keep better track of Exchange records. It now takes the time of two people just to handle the paper flowing into and out of the Exchange.

Data Processing Problems

The problems with data processing have been numerous and complex. Output from the Bureau of Data Processing has generally been sporadic and problem laden.

The documentation that came with the Exchange programs from California was sparse and not always accurate. The systems analysts at the Department were not familiar with Assembler, the computer language in which the programs were written and were not able to find out how the actual programs worked. They were able to get the system working but never understood it enough to anticipate or readily solve problems.

Early in 1974 the Exchange finally began to have fairly regular output. However, in the Spring of 1975 there was another slowdown and all outputs from the Bureau of Data Processing stopped. In June 1975, at the inception of this Project to evaluate the Exchange, the Project staff found that there was, in effect, no Exchange. As a result of the earlier history of difficulties with data processing, the Exchange staff tended to react to this breakdown with resignation.

The Project staff discovered that the immediate reason data were not being processed was that the keypunch vendor had gone bankrupt. (This was not the first time that a vendor punching Exchange forms had met this fate.) Keypunching activities had stopped in March, yet no action had been taken to produce monthly Exchange material by June, nor had the Bureau of Children's Services been informed about the problem.

In response to concern expressed by the Bureau of Children's Services and the Exchange Project, BDP changed the Systems Analyst assigned to the Exchange. The new Analyst was unfamiliar with the Exchange, its programs, procedures and problems. He had difficulty in obtaining such documentation as did exist. Communications between the new program Analyst and his predecessor were minimal. Communications between the Exchange staff and all the Bureau of Data Processing personnel were also inadequate to resolve the problems of the Exchange.

In addition to assigning a new Analyst, BDP decided that keypunching for the Exchange should be done within the Department. This, however, resulted in new problems. Previously the Exchange forms were key punched in a very complicated manner (packed fields) which BDP did not think could be handled by the in-house key-punchers. Therefore the key-punching format

was simplified somewhat and a computer program was written to convert the new keypunch format into one that could be used by the Exchange's existing computer programs. Making the conversion program work, when the internal structure of the programs was not known, was difficult and caused many problems over the last few months. Revising records was the biggest problem, with some revisions put through the system seven times before they came out correctly.

Project staff had to work with the Exchange staff and BDP staff over a period of many months to overcome the communication barriers and to establish the understanding necessary to get the Exchange operating again. Constant communication with BDP staff is still necessary, and probably always will be, to assure prompt attention to problems and maintenance of a schedule. This communication carried out by Project staff was also necessary to provide basic information about the Exchange to new BDP staff and to indicate a sense of priority.

It can readily be seen how the history of the Exchange and its internal procedures affect the way it is perceived and used by participating agencies

The forms, designed with the concept of matching relatively young and healthy Caucasian children with families similar to them in physical characteristics, are seen by agency workers as largely irrelevant to today's waiting children. Although the need for change is recognized, the forms have not been changed much because of the difficulty of changing the matching program. The forms were not designed to be readily key-punched, thus keypunching is cumbersome.

Agencies have complained of out-of-date referrals and inaccurate information. Delays and errors in data processing compound the effects of agency delay in filling out forms, and results in an Exchange that is not only out-of-date, but one that generated inappropriate referrals.

The proliferating complexity of Exchange office procedures and filing systems kept Exchange staff from following up as vigorously as was needed with the BDP, or for that matter, with the agencies.

Other Exchanges and Listing Services

From the 15 exchanges that responded to the questionnaire it was found that operations ranged from very small exchanges with 14 children (Minnesota) to computer listings of 200 or more children (Michigan and California). Some of the smaller exchanges had for years primarily provided the service of placing babies in communities where the mother was not known, but now have curtailed operations because the number of healthy white infants has drastically declined. Some listings or exchanges have responded to changing needs and are trying to be useful in placing hard-to-place children, but have few families listed for this kind of child. Awareness of the hard-to-place child varies from state to state, but most are behind New York State in their recognition of the possibility of adoption for older, non-white and handicapped children or sibling groups.

The degree to which an exchange or listing is seen as central or integral to the state's adoption service varies tremendously. In states where there is little expectation of placing older children, and few children are perceived as available, the service is not central and it is staffed by one person, sometimes on a part-time basis. Where there is a greater commitment to, and expectation of, adoption for these children, the activity is greater.

Five out-of-state exchange operations are of special interest to New York due to their volume or their manner of operation. They are California, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan and Texas. The two New York operations and ARENA are also of interest. These will be discussed separately below.

The other ten services can be described briefly. Indiana started a listing book with pictures of children and families in January, 1975. Missouri is starting such as of Summer, 1975. A parent group in the District of Columbia started a picture book of hard-to-place children from that area in the Spring of 1975. None of these can be evaluated yet. Six states -- Louisiana, Minnesota, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio and Virginia -- have small state matching systems without pictures, run manually, that serve children and families within the State. Arizona has a small listing service that sends out a list of selected hard-to-place children, and of families who might take hard-to-place children, but does not make referrals.

Certain aspects of these small listing services and exchanges point to important considerations. Some departments are able to provide additional services to local agencies in conjunction with the exchange function. The services include informational materials and newsletters on adoption matters, publicity efforts for specific children, general material on hard-to-place children, adoption consultants and field workers available to local units, and educational work with both agencies and citizen groups. Those exchanges that did not have these additional services felt they needed them.

Of the ten small operations, six were exchanges; they match children and families and send out referrals to the agencies. Most of these exchanges do not provide a list or even a statistical picture of all the

waiting children registered; they have not helped agencies become aware of the change in available children. As a result the exchanges find that agencies are still studying families who want healthy white infants rather than recruiting for hard-to-place children.

What is considered hard-to-place varies from state to state. Many consider children hard-to-place who in New York State would be easily adoptable. There are many indications that permanency was not considered a possible goal for many children. Black children over four years of age, and in some States over one year of age, were not considered placeable for adoption.

Many exchanges still seem to look for children for their families rather than for families for the waiting children. They have no procedure for looking at the pool of available children in the state, so that they can demand that these children be listed. Demographic data on children, who are free for adoption, listed and placed, is very difficult to obtain. Information on whether withdrawals were for placement and whether placements were through the exchange, local agency, out-of-state, etc. was generally missing or unclear.

In the seven systems of greatest interest to the Project the definition of "hard-to-place" is more nearly similar to New York State's. Staff in all of these felt that exchanges or listing services were essential but that for maximum impact they need to have resources available to help agencies move into new kinds of adoption. The programs of greatest significance for New York State are those in California, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan and Texas and the two within New York. Except in terms of their relatively large size and focus on hard-to-place children, these programs have little in common. Three involve a non-governmental agency; two are operated by the State Department of Social Services; one is run by a city Department of Social Services; one is run by the State Department of Health. They include a variety of combinations of the matching and listing concepts. Michigan and California utilize a computer, California to match and Michigan to list. Massachusetts and ARENA (Adoption Resource Exchange of North America) use manual matching, while Texas and Illinois, New York City and CAP (Council of Adoptive Parents) rely on picture listing. Somewhat more detailed description of each follow.

California was the first to initiate a computer matching system in 1970 (Adoption Resource Referral Center - ARRC). The program was started by the Department of Social Services but shifted in 1971 to the Department of Health. Children free 60 days are registered, as are approved families waiting 60 days. As a result of concerns that referrals are not timely or appropriate, a revised program is now being instituted. The information gathered on family and children and the basis for matching are being changed to increase relative stress on behavioral rather than physical characteristic At parent group request, a picture listing system is also planned but the relation between the two services has not been worked out yet. ARRC has few associated services, in part because of discontinuation of field representatives in early 1970's.

Illinois started the first picture listing service in 1971. The Child Care Association of Illinois (not a provider of direct service) supplies this service on a statewide basis. The form is a looseleaf picture book, comparable to a realtor's listing of properties, showing pictures of children and families. Originally the printing was contributed by the State Board of Realtors. Other organizations have contributed printing, with the remainder of the budget obtained largely from the State. The Illinois Listing Service requires inquiries to come through their central office and makes referrals on the basis of such inquiries. It does no matching. I.L.S. uses the referral process to monitor and facilitate performance, i.e. encouraging workers to follow-up promptly on such referrals. I.L.S. is still directed by the originator of the idea who uses very creative communication methods to motivate workers and highlight the importance of the task. A good deal of service is provided in overcoming communication problems and encouraging adoption service through newsletters, meetings, etc.

Massachusetts Adoption Resources Exchange (MARE) is also a privately organized service, although it is largely state funded. MARE provides educational materials and holds meetings on adoption matters for all agencies in Massachusetts and New England. It registers waiting children and approved families interested in such children (neither limited to Massachusetts) and sends out referrals on the basis of manual matching. MARE was the first to use children's pictures but only to highlight especially hard-to-place youngsters and illustrate categories. In addition to these activities, the organization works closely with the Open Door Society (a parent group) and the Black Recruitment Committee, an organization of Black social workers. Both organizations attempt to recruit families for waiting children.

Michigan Adoption Resource Exchange (also MARE) is a completely different operation. Within the Department of Social Services, it is built upon a compulsory computerized tracking system of the foster care population which was initiated statewide in 1973. In filling out the forms for this system workers have the option of requesting listing with MARE of those children for whom adoption is the plan. This, however, is wholly voluntary, and not widely used. Even when used, providing a photograph and/or a written description of the child requires a separate voluntary act. If MARE listing is checked, the computer provides a tape to the Exchange. The information on the tape is the child's age, sex and race, whether he is handicapped mentally, physically or emotionally and which agency has him in care. This is then printed on an individual looseleaf page and sent to agencies in the state. Pictures are available in only one fourth of the cases, descriptions in fewer. Thus the result is a book with unattractive pages largely devoid of interesting information.

The Michigan Department's concept is that agencies decide for which of the listed children they could recruit, rather than use the listing as a catalog for prospective parents. Agencies get in touch with the child's worker and learn whatever further information is needed for such recruiting. Workers are said to be very resistant to all computer materials. There are plans for extensive data on the nature of the children listed,

waiting but not listed, placed, etc., but a change in computer hardware has for nearly a year delayed any data on the adoption program. Though the book does not give an individualized picture of children, and statistics have been delayed, leafing through it does indicate to a worker the nature of the waiting population.

Texas has a picture listing service (not limited to the State) listing both children and families. The agency for each child or family is indicated on the page, so that inquiries do not have to go through the central office. As a result, that office has little knowledge of how the service works and little opportunity to affect it.

The CAP Book was started as an activity of the Rochester area Council of Adoptive Parents in 1972. It was a small operation run by volunteers using snapshots of the children. In 1973, New York State provided some funds to CAP, and is now funding a paid staff. It is a voluntary photo listing service for children in New York State who are available for adoption both legally free and ones who are in the process of being freed. Staff and volunteers from the Board of Directors visit agencies throughout the state to talk about adoption possibilities for the waiting child and to help agencies register the children with CAP. Inquiries are accepted from interested families as well as agencies. Referrals are made through the office, and follow-ups on referrals are done on an informal basis. Members of the Board of Directors are active on adoption committees on a statewide basis.

The New York City Adoption Exchange Book was started in June 1973. It lists only New York City public charges who are legally free and restricts the listings mainly to children who are hard-to-place, i.e. severely handicapped white children, white teenagers and Black children over four years old. Referrals are made through the office with periodic monitoring regarding the placement plans for children who are listed and have had a number of inquiries. Registration is mandatory when adoption is the plan and no home is avaliable. Support services include information on all adoption matters. The staff facilitates placement of listed children when agencies or prospective parents have problems with one another or with technical aspects of subsidy, etc. The staff also works with the New York City Department's Community Education office on a TV News program that features waiting children. CAP and New York City Adoption Exchange Book personnel work together when appropriate and children who will be difficult to place are frequently registered in both books.

The Adoption Resource Exchange of North America (ARENA) was started by the Child Welfare League in 1968. It has been funded by both private and public sources and is now supported mostly by private funds. Legally free children and families are listed on a voluntary basis; 888 agencies from all fifty (50) states, U.S. territories and Canada, work with ARENA. The staff matches waiting children and families by hand with some use of a card sort system. Computerization is being considered as a way of increasing the staff productivity. The ARENA staff provides a wide range of services to strengthen state adoption programs and exchanges and to assist in finding homes for waiting children.

Comparison among states is extremely difficult. Their foster care populations are different in size and ethnic composition, depending upon the state's social circumstances. Different proportions of the foster children are free for adoption; different proportions of those free are served in any way by the exchange or listing. Thus the proportion of listed children who are minority, older, handicapped or sibling groups varies greatly from state to state. Even data on placements are not comparable since indirect placements are usually a major result, and are treated differently in each case. Tables 10 and 11 present comparative data on all of these dates and programs.

TABLE 10

Characteristics of Other Exchanges and Listing Services

	Matchings		Listings			
	Computer	Manual	Child	Child/ Family	With Referral System	Without Referral System
Arizona*				X		X
California	X					
District of Columbia			X		X	
Illinois				X	X	
Indiana				X	X	
Louisiana		X				
Massachusetts		X				
Michigan**			X			X
Minnesota		X				
Missouri				X		
New Jersey		X				
North Carolina		X				
Ohio		X				
Texas				X		X
Virginia		X				
N.Y.C. Adoption Exchange Book			X		X	
The CAP Book			X		X	
N.Y.S. Adoption Exchange	X					
ARENA		X				

* -- only listing service without pictures
** -- computer used for listings but not matchings

TABLE 11

COMPARATIVE DATA ON SELECTED ADOPTION EXCHANGES OR LISTING SERVICES

	No. in Foster Care in 1971 (1)	Estimated No. Free for Adoption in 1974 (5)	No. now Active in Listing (5)	No. of Agency Adoptions in year	No. of Children Withdrawn from Listing 1 year (4 and 5)
Arizona	3,800		20	487(3)	
California	36,900		247	4,266(3)	100
District of Columbia	2,900				
Illinois	17,800		200		
Indiana	8,200	694	70	1,546(2)	
Louisiana	5,700			671(2)	
Massachusetts	8,900	1,000	200	1,450(2)	125
Michigan	7,800	1,200	200		77 in 3 mos.
Minnesota	10,800		14	1,775(2)	30 in 3 mos.
Missouri	4,800	276		1,029(3)	
New Jersey	12,400			1,529(2)	
North Carolina	9,200		94	946(3)	10
Ohio	19,900		214		29 in 3 mos.
Texas	12,000		128	2,420(3)	175
Virginia	11,500	1,600	114	1,203(2)	
N.Y.C. Adoption Exchange Book	23,000(6)	1,600	228	1,100(6)	110
The CAP Book	n.a.	n.a.	209	n.a.	101
N.Y.S. Adoption Exchange	48,200	3,000	962	4,421(2)	383
ARENA	n.a.	n.a.	1,199	n.a.	706

See Appendix L for footnotes

Overview of Findings

Since its beginning 3 years ago, the Exchange has directly resulted in the placement of fewer than 100 children, because 95% of the families listed were never interested in adopting the children listed -- almost all of whom are school-age, Black, or seriously handicapped.

Most individuals involved with the Exchange, whether parents, workers, supervisors, or those directly working with it, had very little positive to say about it. They find it laborious and generally not useful. It doesn't produce referrals for their children and families very often; when it does, they are often out-of-date, with the referred child or family already withdrawn. Often the referral is considered inappropriate, usually because the child is more handicapped than the agency believes the family will accept. The usefulness of the Exchange is considered to be mainly in circulating information about what kinds of children are available for adoption, and in facilitating the placement of a small number of hard-to-place youngsters.

Much of the distress expressed with the Exchange appears to have arisen from the mistaken assumption that waiting somewhere there were either the kinds of babies families wanted, or approved families who would adopt the waiting children. Since this was not the case, the number of referrals that could be produced was limited. Partly because of this, partly because many social workers do not care for computer printouts or forms, and partly because communication with the Exchange center offered little pleasure or benefit to workers, they were often remiss in updating childrens' and families' registrations. This had the effect of producing out-of-date referrals, whose receipt further discouraged agencies from working with the Exchange.

Two other factors made it very difficult for the Exchange to operate effectively. One was the use of a computer program written in a programming language not familiar to many in the Department of Social Services' Bureau of Data Processing. The second problem was the addition of the tasks of mounting the Exchange and explaining it to the workload of the Department of Social Services' Division of Services without the timely addition of appropriate personnel.

While many in the State have felt the Exchange to be markedly unsuccessful, this is not true by comparison with other state Exchanges. The New York Exchange lists many more children, a much greater proportion of the State's foster care population, and a much harder to place group of children than do the other Services. While the New York Exchange's placements are a smaller proportion of the children listed than is true elsewhere, this seems to be largely due to the kinds of children listed, as much as to the Exchange's procedures. On the other hand, examination of other states' programs indicates that the provision of additional services to agencies and workers would greatly benefit the Exchange in a variety of ways.

IMPLICATIONS

The major requirement for success of any system designed to place children waiting for adoption, is the recruiting of families willing to adopt such children. The Listing can be a valuable tool for such recruiting, but unless it is actively used for this purpose it will not result in the placement of many children. It is thus essential to build into the Picture Listing Service the capacity to encourage recruiting, statewide and locally, by agencies, family groups and others.

A Listing Service will be a communication system between a central point and all agencies. Its success will in large measure depend on the agencies' willingness to engage fully in this communication. It is therefore important to build into the Picture Listing Service the capacity to respond to agency staffs in a variety of ways which will encourage them to participate. These responses include many kinds of technical assistance as well as appropriate human responses both in the form of appreciation for jobs well done and sympathy for difficult problems.

Building in these capacities and assuring the ability to accurately handle information on a large number of children will require a highly skilled staff, and considerable flexibility in its disposition for central office to field and back.

As adoptive parent organizations have been one of the greatest resources to date for recruiting adoptive families, it is important that the Service have constructive working relations with these groups. Ideally the participation of such groups should be designed into the Service from the beginning.

The listing of hard-to-place children would be ineffective as a placement tool if it were not for the adoption subsidy program. Other state policies also have a vital effect on adoption programs throughout the state. The Service will be in a position to obtain more information about the existing policies and regulations than would reach the Department through other channels. Therefore it is important that the Service be so structured as to be able to channel this information appropriately and have policy input into the State Department of Social Services.

APPENDICES

A. No. 7752-A, Social Service Law - Chapter 702

B. 1973 Memorandum to the Department of Social Services from New York State Adoption and Foster Parent Groups.

C. Agency questionnaire.

D. Interview schedule for Computer Generated Referral study.

E. Parent group questionnaire.
Mailing list of parent groups.

F. Questionnaire on Other State Exchanges.
Names and titles of informants -- Out-of-State Contacts.

G. New York State Adoption Exchange Child and Family registration forms.
Updated printout.

H. Computer Generated Referral.

I. Quarterly Report.

J. Sample page of monthly listings of New York State Adoption Exchange.

K. "You-Me" - April - May, 1975

APPENDIX A

No. 7752-A, Social Services Law - Chapter 702

Assembly Bill 7752-A

1975-1976 Regular Sessions

March 25, 1975

An Act to amend the Social Services Law, in relation to establishing a state-wide adoption service and repealing section three hundred seventy-two-b.

Chapter 702 of the Social Services Law of 1975.

§ 372-b. Statewide adoption service*

1. There shall be established by the department either directly or through purchase a statewide adoption service which shall serve all authorized agencies in the state as a means of recruiting adoptive families for children who have been legally freed for adoption but have remained in foster care for a period of three months or more. Such period in foster care shall include any period of foster care immediately preceding the date on which the child was legally freed for adoption. The service shall provide descriptions and photographs of such children, and shall also provide any other information deemed useful in the recruitment of adoptive families for each such child. The exchange shall be updated monthly.

2. The service may be organized on a regional basis, but shall be provided to all authorized child caring agencies and in accordance with the regulations of the department, to all appropriate citizen groups and other organizations and associations interested in children's services.

3. The department shall promulgate regulations governing the operations of the adoption service. Such regulations shall require all authorized agencies in the state to make diligent efforts to make adoption available for every child needing a permanent home. The board, after consultation with the department, shall promulgate rules to maintain enlightened adoption policies and standards.

4. Each authorized agency shall refer to the adoption service, accompanied by a photograph and description, as shall be required by departmental regulations, each child in its care who has been legally freed for adoption and who has been in foster care for the period specified in subdivision one of this section and for whom no adoptive home has been found. The department shall establish criteria by which an agency may determine that a child need not be listed on the service. Such children's names shall be forwarded to the department by the authorized agency, with reference to the specific reason by which the child was not placed on the service. The department shall establish procedures for periodic review of the status of such children. If the department, in accordance with the criteria it has established, determines that adoption would be appropriate for a child

not placed with the service, the agency shall forthwith list the child. Each authorized agency may voluntarily refer any child who has been legally freed for adoption.

5. Expenditures by a social services district for the care and maintenance of a child who has not been referred to the adoption service in accordance with the requirements of this section shall not be subject to state reimbursement.

This section is added by Laws 1975, Ch. 702, eff. April 1, 1976, and former § 372-b (Statewide adoption exchange), set for supra, is repealed, subject to the proviso of § 2 of Ch. 702:

*§ 2. This act shall take effect on the first day of April, nineteen hundred seventy-six; provided, however, that the department and the social services districts are authorized to take such steps prior to the effective date of this act as may be necessary to facilitate the implementation of the statewide adoption service.

APPENDIX B

1973 Memorandum to the Department of Social Services
from New York State Adoption and Foster Parent Group.

MEMORANDUM

TO: The New York State Department of Social Services

FROM: New York State Adoption and Foster Parent Groups

SUBJECT: The New York State Adoption Exchange

The undersigned citizens groups, many of which have been engaged in recruiting homes for children over many years, are extremely concerned abc the situation of the New York State Adoption Exchange. Two years after this operation was formalized by law, operation of this exchange is still ineffective. This is best documented by the admission of Mr. Kasius to the New York State Board of May 23, 1973, that "about ten children" have been placed through the Exchange over the last 18 months. In the meantime, hundreds of children, for whom this Exchange could represent an excellent opportunity to find homes, have grown two years older. Those experienced in adoption and foster care are painfully and scornfully aware of the irrevocable loss these children have suffered.

The undersigned groups are concerned that under the present procedure this situation will continue both for the children already on the Exchange as well as for those that will be referred to the Exchange in the future as a result of Foster Care Reviews and other procedures.

This memorandum is written with the intent to identify some of the causes for this existing situation and to recommend solutions.

The Department of Social Services, in cooperation with agencies and citizens groups, could identify adoptive homes for many children now on the Exchange. A large number of these children, according to Mr. Kasius, are neither physically handicapped nor mentally retarded. It is the common experience of the New York State Citizens Groups, that because of their age, race, physical or mental condition, the children now on the Exchange will not be placed without special efforts by the Department. As relegated by the Adoption Exchange Law, the Department must take a spirite active leadership in this effort.

At present, the Department of Social Services has taken the attitude that "monthly matchings" of incoming requests by agencies fulfills the purpose and spirit of the New York State Adoption Exchange Law. Although relying on these referral procedures, the Department neither is supplying agencies with information about available children nor does it undertake or encourage special recruitment efforts. The undersigned consider this to be the main cause for the present failure of the Exchange. To be effective, operation of the Exchange must be expanded beyond "monthly matchings" into a "multiple listings" operation.

The following immediate actions to correct the existing situation are recommended:

1. The purpose of the New York State Adoption Exchange is stated in Section 372b of the Social Services Law "to serve authorized agencies in the State as a means of identifying possible adoptive homes on a statewide basis for children."

In order to be able to inform adoptive applicants about available children, agencies must have information about them. To date, this information is not available. Agencies receive only information about children "matched" to family registrations submitted by the agency. Caseworkers have no possible source of information about children other than those available through their own agencies. To our knowledge, the only "statistical profile" issued by the State Department of Social Services so far has been a list of the number of children and families registered by individual agencies. A statistical profile of the children available by age, sex, race, handicap, etc. should be issued monthly by the Department of Social Services. Such information should be easily available from the computer listing.

2. In recruiting potential parents, there is no substitute for personal information about specific children, especially information containing photographs.

Many potential adoptive parents initially have unrealistic, at times exaggerated ideas about handicapped or biracial children, etc. When confronted with real children rather than by hypothetical situations, responses are often surprisingly different. This does in no way infer that adoptive parents must not be alerted about potential problems in adopting particular children.

Several groups such as CAP and FFF have compiled private lists with child profiles with the aid of local agencies. These lists, all of which contain photographs, have been extremely helpful in recruiting parents.

The Department should direct agencies to supply photographs with the profiles of children registered on the Exchange. The Department should insure that such profiles are available to agencies and citizens groups for their interaction with applicants.

Immediately available for this purpose are two private listings, already used by several agencies in the State: The "CAP-BOOK", used by the Council of Adoptive Parents of Rochester and the "Adoption Exchange Book" compiled by the New York City Special Services for Children. The Department could direct all New York State agencies to supply photographs with profiles of all their children registered on the Exchange to one of these listing services.

Matching on the New York State Adoption Exchange should be carried out at least weekly rather than monthly. Information passed on to agencies as a result of such matchings should contain photographs of the children.

3. The Department should arrange, encourage and support public servic announcements on radio, television and newspapers on specific children. The Department should make sure that applicants will get information and cooperation (home studies) when they subsequently turn to agencies.

Public media generally have been very responsive to requests to assist in recruiting of parents. It can easily be documented that such public annoucements often are very successful in recruiting adoptive applicants. The Department should encourage agencies, citizens groups and media to publicize hard-to-place children.

Since the majority of children listed on the Exchange are Black, a particular effort must be made to recruit Black parents through TV ("Black homes for Black children"), magazine articles and interaction with Black community groups. According to ARENA, for example, response to articles in Ebony and Jet by Blacks has been "overwhelming."

Unfortunately, agencies have not always cooperated with couples inquiring about the adoption of spot-lighted children. The Department should issue a memorandum alerting agencies that:

(1) Cooperation is requested under the New York State Adoption Exchange Law.

(2) Couples responding to publicity be immediately accepted as applicants, regardless of the number of people on the agencies' waiting lists.

(3) Home studies for such couples be started no later than four weeks after the agencies have first been contacted.

(4) Special expenses of agencies be reimbursed for out-of-country adoptions.

4. The classifications "temporarily" and "permanently not ready for placement" affecting 800-900 children (according to Mr. Peter Kasius,) 4/19/73 should be abandoned.

The "not ready for placement" categories prevent nearly half of the children now registered with the state exchange from ever being referred in response to family registrations. The unadoptable classifications are contrary to the adoption exchange law which is to facilitate the adoptive placement elsewhere in the state of children not placed in their own communities. Every child legally free for adoption should be available for "matching" with potential adoptive families.

An exchange was never necessary nor primarily mandated for the placement of healthy infants and pre-school-age children. Children not placed in six months time and consequently registered with the exchange are by definition "hard-to-place". The State Department of Social Services, through the adoption exchange, should make special efforts to seek families for these children, not write them off as "unadoptable" and deny them any opportunity for adoptive placement.

Many children who had been considered unadoptable by agencies have been placed. There are families willing and able to take children with all kinds of special needs. The decision as to whether a child can be placed should be made only in the context of a real opportunity to have a family.

5. The Standards for Adoption, mandated by Section 372b of the Social Services Law in 1971, regulating adoption practices and policies, should be issued immediately to local agencies and citizens groups.

Once issued, these rules should be reviewed and revised whenever necessary.

6. The Department of Social Services should encourage and assure inputs from both agencies and citizens organizations.

The operation of the Exchange should be explained to and discussed with agencies in special meetings and/or a Departmental newsletter.

The undersigned groups would welcome the opportunity to meet with representatives of the Department at bimonthly intervals to discuss matters concerning the operation of the Exchange.

July 1973

Adoptive Families of Westchester
Box 27, Dobbs Ferry, N.Y. 10522

APC - Adoptive Parents Committee
Box 543, Teaneck, N.J. 07666

COAC - Council on Adoptable Children
61 Gramercy Park, New York, N.Y. 10010

CAP - Council of Adoptive Parents
16 Dumont St., Rochester, N.Y. 14617

FACT - Families for All Children
Box 27, Ouquaga, N.Y. 13826

FFF - Familes for the Future
Box 725, Schenectady, N.Y. 12301

NCAP - National Council of
Adoptive Parents
Box 543, Teaneck, N.J. 07666

OFFER - Organization of Foster Families
for Equality and Reform
Box 110, E. Meadow, N.Y. 11554

ODS - Open Door Society of Long Island
1337 Waverly Ave., Farmingville, N.Y. 1173

PACT - Parents and Children Together
28 Tietjen Ave., Kingston, N.Y. 12401

Rockland COAC
Box 554, New City, N.Y. 10956

APPENDIX C

Agency Questionnaire

Welfare Research Inc.

N. Y. STATE ADOPTION EXCHANGE PROJECT

2 WORLD TRADE CENTER · ROOM 2850
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10047
Telephone: (212) 488-5290

Dear Sir or Madame,

The New York State Adoption Exchange Project has been federally funded in recognition of the Exchange's potential for assisting in the adoptive placement of many waiting children, and in recognition that this potential has not been fully met to date.

Information regarding your experience with the Exchange will help point the way to improving it. Please make whatever comments you have in the attached spaces and feel free to use more space if needed.

1. Has the Exchange been useful? In what ways? With regard to what kinds of children and families?

2. Many technical problems with the Exchange have been noted. Can you comment on the problems you have had in the areas of registration and inappropriate or untimely matches?

3. If you have been informed of matches you wished to pursue, what has been your experience in communicating with the other agency or otherwise in following up?

4. One problem which has been identified is that agencies use very different reasons for classifying children as "Temporarily or Permanently Not Placeable". It is felt that many of these reasons need not prevent a child from being adopted. Because of this, the State Department is planning to develop guidelines for decisions regarding placeability. Please give us the benefit of your opinion as to what criteria you would like to see included in these guidelines.

Thank you for your comments and suggestions. I will write or call shortly to discuss this further.

Sincerely,

Hannà Grossman,
Project Director

HG:bj

Name _____

Title _____

Agency _____

Address _____

APPENDIX D

Interview Schedule for Computer Generated Referral Study

NYSAE Matching for April 1975

Date: _____

Caller: _____

Agency: _____ Telephone #: _____

Worker: _____

Circle which one:

Child _____ # _____ Parent _____ # _____

Age _____ Sex _____ Race _____ Race _____ Single or Married ___

Handicap _____ Agency _____

Agency _____

Date received Matching: _____

Was it appropriate: _____

Reasons: _____

Did you contact agency: _____

When and how? _____

_____

If not, why not? _____

_____

Results: _____

_____

_____

Comments or procedures: (improve, etc.) _____

_____

_____

Did you return State Exchange forms regarding Matching? _____

If the child already planned for, had the Exchange been notified and when?

_____

If family withdrawn, when? _____

Comments on other Matchings:

Appropriate? _____ Inappropriate? _____

Reasons: _____

_____

Any comments regarding State Exchange put on separate sheet or back of this page.

APPENDIX E

Parent Group Questionnaire

Mailing List of Parent Groups

NEW YORK STATE ADOPTION EXCHANGE PROJECT

2 World Trade Center - Room 2850
New York, New York 10047
(212) 488-5290, or 5291

The following questions cover some of the areas of concern regarding the New York State Adoption Exchange. Please feel free to add any other comments or recommendations you might have.

What has been your group's experience with:

1. Listing of families on the Exchange.

2. Matching with children (how many? what happened?)

3. Experience with local agencies (do they use the exchange? do they find it useful?)

NEW YORK STATE ADOPTION EXCHANGE PROJECT
(cont.)

4. Have you had any experience with the technical problems of the Exchange?

5. Suggestions for improvement.

NAME _____

ORGANIZATION _____

ADDRESS _____

_____

Citizen Groups Contacted

Mrs. Jill Parison
Allegany Council of Adoptive Parents
130 Madison St.
Wellsville, N.Y. 14895

Mrs. Joan McNamara
Adoptive Families of Westchester
6 Madison St.
Ossising, N.Y. 10562

Mr. Gary Rolnick, President
New York State Adoptive Parents Committee
210 Fifth Ave.
New York, N.Y. 10010

Mrs. Lois Jetty
Cayuga County Foster Parent Association
Box 108
Martville, N.Y. 13111

Mrs. Judith Schaffer
Council on Adoptable Children
125 East 23rd St.
New York, N.Y. 10010

Mrs. Lynda Bailey
Council on Adoptive Parents
35 Bittersweet Road
Fairport, N.Y. 14450

Mrs. Elizabeth TeSelle
Council of Adoptive Families of Central New York
184 Harwood Ave.
Syracuse, N.Y. 13224

Rev. Thurston Shumway, President
Families for All Children Today
Ouquaga, N.Y. 13826

Mr. Roger Hooverman
Families for the Future
19 Londen Place
Schenectady, N.Y.

Citizen Groups Contacted (cont.)

Mrs. Peg Van Loo
Hudson Valley Adoptive Families
113 Montgomery St.
Poughkeepsie, N.Y. 12601

Organization of Foster Families for Equality and Reform
P.O. Box 110
East Meadow, N.Y. 11554

Mr. Jack Janson, President
Open Door Society of Long Island
5 Winside Lane
Coram, N.Y. 11727

Mrs. Joan Locke
Parents & Children Together
28 Tietjeu Ave.
Kingston, N,Y, 12401

Parents for All Children
65 Faucher Ave.
Kenmore, N.Y. 14223

Parents for All Children of Chantaugua County
25 Chestnut St.
Westfield, N.Y. 14787

Mrs. Virginia Hood
Rockland County Council on Adoptive Children
22 Old Schoolhouse Road
New City, N.Y. 10956

APPENDIX F

Questionnaire on Other State Exchanges

Names and Titles of Informants -- Out-of-State Contacts

NEW YORK STATE ADOPTION EXCHANGE PROJECT
2 World Trade Center - Rm. 2850
New York, N.Y. 10047
(212) 488-5290

QUESTIONNAIRE ON OTHER STATE EXCHANGES

1. Type of Exchange:

   Compulsory or Voluntary _____

   Length of time in operation _____

2. Numbers and characteristics of children/families listed.

3. Success - numbers and/or proportion of matches, placements, withdrawals

4. Agency and public attitudes toward Exchange; is it helpful in changing attitudes about adoption?

5. What is the scope and content of your contact with child registering agencies?

6. How well does the Exchange work; what are its positive and negative aspects?

7. What would be an ideal system?

Please include any materials that will help us understand your Exchange more fully.

Name _____

Agency _____

Out-of-State Contacts

Arizona:	Miss Katherine Price Adoption Consultant Arizona Dept. of Economic Security Phoenix, Airzona
California:	Ms. Mary Sullivan Chief of Adoption Services State Department of Health Sacramento, California
	Ms. Barbara M. Merritt Adoption Resources and Referral Center (ARRC) Adoption Services Section State Department of Health Sacramento, California
	Ms. Betty Kemmel Placement Coordinator Los Angeles County Department of Adoptions Los Angeles, California
	Mrs. Lynda Dunn President North America Council on Adoptive Children Riverside, California
District of Columbia:	Mr. Joseph P. Yeldell* Director Department of Human Resources Washington, D.C.
Illinois:	Rev. Charles Filson Adoption Coordinator Child Care Association of Illinois Director of Illinois Adoption Listing Service (ALS) Springfield, Illinois 62704
	Ms. Mary Ann Kern Social Services Specialist Department of Children & Family Services Springfield, Illinois
	Miss Vivan Hargrave Director Project on use of Subsidies to increase adoption of Black children. Chicago, Illinois

* indirect communication

Indiana:	Mrs. Pat Vesper Consultant Adoption Resource Exchange Divsion of Child Welfare - Social Services Department of Public Welfare Indianapolis, Indiana
Louisiana:	Miss Wilma Salmon Chief Community Based Services Louisiana Health and Human Resources Administration - Division of Family Services Baton Rouge, Louisiana
Massachusetts:	Miss Jane Quinton Executive Director Massachusetts Adoption Resource Exchange (M.A.R.E.) Boston, Massachusetts
	Miss Mary Jo Maxwell Community Organizer, M.A.R.E.
	Mrs. Louis Coggins Referral Coodinator, M.A.R.E.
	Mrs. Lynda Shepard Black Recruitment Committee, M.A.R.E.
	Mrs. Cathy Reardon Open Door Society Boston, Massachusetts
	Ms. Rosemary McCauliffe Director Adoption Placement Unit Department of Social Services Boston, Massachusetts
Michigan:	Mr. Donald L. Haviland Adoption Exchange Coordinator Michigan Adoption Resource Exchange (M.A.R.E.) Lansing, Michigan
	Mrs. Barbara Parsons former President Michigan Council on Adoptive Children Lansing, Michigan
	Mrs. Jan Fairbanks President Michigan Council on Adoptive Children Lansing, Michigan

Minnesota:	Ms. Ruth C. Weidell Adoption Supervisor Minessota Department of Public Welfare St. Paul, Minnesota
	Mrs. Eunice S. Ross Supervisor Adoption Unit Community Services Division Hennepin County Minneapolis, Minnesota
Missouri:	Mrs. Benita Weitzel Adoption Exchange Coordinator Department of Social Services Division of Family Services Jefferson City, Missouri
North Carolina:	Mrs. Robin L. Peacock Supervisor of Adoptions Division of Social Services Raleigh, North Carolina
	Ms. Faye C. Pollard Adoption Analyst Division of Social Services Raleigh, North Carolina
Ohio:	Ms. Patricia Montgomery Placement Services for Children Ohio Department of Public Welfare Columbus, Ohio
Texas:	Mrs. Rosa L. Stewart Program Specialist - Adoptions Family and Children's Services Social Services Branch Austin, Texas
Virginia:	Mrs. Leandra G. Armour Child Welfare Supervisor Adoption Resource Exchange Richmond, Virginia
National:	Mrs. Arlene Nash Director Adoption Resource Exchange of North America (ARENA) New York, New York

APPENDIX G

New York State Adoption Exchange Child & Family Registration Forms

Updated Printout

STATE OF NEW YORK • ADOPTION EXCHANGE CENTER

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICE

NYSAE REGISTRATION
Child

1A. NYSAE NO. (SDSS USE)	SIB. #	1B. ADA NUMBER

1C. NAME OF AGENCY	1D. AGENCY CODE
1E. AGENCY CASE NUMBER	1F. AREA OFFICE

1G. TYPE OF AGENCY
1 ☐ PUBLIC 2 ☐ PRIVATE 3 ☐ OUT OF STATE

2. CHILD'S LEGAL NAME (LAST FIRST MIDDLE)

3. REFER TO AREN
1 ☐ YES 2 ☐ NO

CHARACTERISTICS OF NATURAL MOTHER

4A. NATIONALITY	SDSS USE	4B. RELIGION	SDSS USE
4C. ETHNIC BACKGROUND		4D. OCCUPATION	

4E. BIRTHDATE (MONTH DAY YEAR)

4F. EDUCATION (YEARS COMPLETED)

4G. HEIGHT

4H. WEIGHT

4I. HAIR COLOR
1 ☐ Brown 2 ☐ Black 3 ☐ Blonde 4 ☐ Red 5 ☐ Unknown

4J. EYE COLOR
1 ☐ Brown 2 ☐ Blue 3 ☐ Green 4 ☐ Hazel 5 ☐ Unknown

4K. SKIN COLOR
1 ☐ Light 2 ☐ Medium 3 ☐ Dark 4 ☐ Unknown

4L. HANDICAP

CHARACTERISTICS OF NATURAL FATHER

5A. NATIONALITY	SDSS USE	5B. RELIGION	SDSS USE
5C. ETHNIC BACKGROUND		5D. OCCUPATION	

5E. BIRTHDATE (MONTH DAY YEAR)

5F. EDUCATION (YEARS COMPLETED)

5G. HEIGHT

5H. WEIGHT

5I. HAIR COLOR
1 ☐ Brown 2 ☐ Black 3 ☐ Blonde 4 ☐ Red 5 ☐ Unknown

5J. EYE COLOR
1 ☐ Brown 2 ☐ Blue 3 ☐ Green 4 ☐ Hazel 5 ☐ Unknown

5K. SKIN COLOR
1 ☐ Light 2 ☐ Medium 3 ☐ Dark 4 ☐ Unknown

5L. HANDICAP

6. PHYSICAL AND EMOTIONAL HEALTH OF FAMILY MEMBERS (INCLUDE HANDICAPS) (Limit - 100 letters and spaces)

7. LEGAL STATUS OF CHILD

	MONTH	DAY	YEAR
A. DATE CHILD ACCEPTED FOR STUDY			
B. DATE CHILD CAME UNDER CARE AND SUPERVISION			
C. DATE OF VOLUNTARY RELINQUISHMENT BY FATHER			
D. DATE OF VOLUNTARY RELINQUISHMENT BY MOTHER			
E. DATE MOTHER'S PARENTAL RIGHTS TERMINATED BY COURT ACTION			
F. DATE FATHER'S PARENTAL RIGHTS TERMINATED BY COURT ACTION			

G. CHILD LEGALLY FREE? (State Plan in Item 8) ☐ YES ☐ N

8. COMMENTS CONCERNING NATURAL PARENTS AND/OR LEGAL STATUS OF CHILD (Limit - 200 letters and spaces)

AGENCY REPRESENTATIVE

DATE

FORM DSS-1884 (REV. 8/74) (FACE)

CHARACTERISTICS OF CHILD

9. CHILD'S BIRTHDATE (MONTH DAY YEAR)

10. CHILD'S SEX
1 ☐ MALE 2 ☐ FEMALE

11. ETHNIC BACKGROUND (CHECK ALL APPLICABLE BOXES)

(1) WHITE ☐
(2) PUERTO RICAN ☐
(3) NEGRO ☐
(4) AMERICAN INDIAN ☐
(STATE TRIBE) _____
(5) CHINESE ☐
(6) JAPANESE ☐
(7) FILIPINO ☐
(8) OTHER ☐
(SPECIFY) _____

11A. JEWISH BACKGROUND (IF YES, COMMENT IN ITEM 24)
1 ☐ YES 2 ☐ NO

12. HAIR COLOR
1 ☐ BROWN 2 ☐ BLACK 3 ☐ BLONDE 4 ☐ RED

13. EYE COLOR
1 ☐ BROWN 2 ☐ BLUE 3 ☐ GREEN 4 ☐ HAZEL

14. SKIN COLOR
1 ☐ LIGHT 2 ☐ MEDIUM 3 ☐ DARK

15. INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT (See Item 24 Below *)
1 ☐ SLOW 2 ☐ AVERAGE 3 ☐ ACCELERATED 4 ☐ UNKNOWN

16. CHILD'S BUILD
1 ☐ SHORT 2 ☐ AVERAGE 3 ☐ TALL

17. HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE COMPLETED

18. HANDICAP (CHECK ALL APPLICABLE BOXES AND DESCRIBE IN ITEM 24)

A. ☐ NONE

	CORRECTABLE	REQUIRES ON-GOING MEDICAL ATTENTION	AFFECTS APPEARANCE	AFFECTS SOCIAL OR PHYSICAL FUNCTIONING
B. PHYSICAL	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐
C. EMOTIONAL	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐

19. RELIGION PREFERRED FOR CHILD — NO PREFERENCE ☐ — SDSS USE

20. KIND OF FAMILY NEEDED FOR CHILD
1 ☐ CHILDLESS FAMILY 2 ☐ FAMILY WITH CHILDREN 3 ☐ NO RESTRICTIONS

21. SIBLINGS TO BE PLACED TOGETHER (COMMENT IN ITEM 24)
1 ☐ YES 2 ☐ NO

22. PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT OF CHILD (DESCRIBE) (Limit - 100 letters and spaces)

23A. READINESS FOR ADOPTION (CHECK ONE)
1 ☐ PLACEMENT 2 ☐ TEMPORARILY NOT PLACEABLE 3 ☐ PERMANENTLY NOT PLACEABLE

23B. PERMANENTLY NOT PLACEABLE BECAUSE: (CHECK ALL APPLIC
1 ☐ PHYSICAL IMPAIRMENT 2 ☐ MENTAL IMPAIRMENT 3 ☐ OTHER (INCLUDING AG

23C. CARE BEING PROVIDED FOR CHILD PERMANENTLY NOT PLACEABLE (CHECK ALL APPLICABLE)
1 ☐ TEMPORARY FOSTER HOME
2 ☐ PERMANENT (OR CONTRACT) FOSTER HOME
3 ☐ CARE IN HOSPITAL
4 ☐ CARE IN OTHER INSTITUTION
5 ☐ GUARDIAN APPOINTED
6 ☐ OTHER (SPECIFY) _____

24. * If "SLOW" is checked under intellectual development in item 15, please check one of the following boxes:

A. ☐ NOT RETARDED (Clarify Below)

B. *Degree of Retardation*

1. ☐ MILD - Has potential for significant independent functioning when appropriate education and training is provided.
2. ☐ MODERATE - Self care is a realistic goal although a sheltered environment will always be needed.
3. ☐ SEVERE - Very limited capacity for independent functioning as adjustment and development is characterized by feeble intellectual ability, poor motor control, and speech problems.
4. ☐ PROFOUND - Needs constant care and supervision.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (Limit - 200 letters and spaces)

STATE OF NEW YORK — NYSAE REGISTRATION RECEIPT-CHILD — 1D.AGENCY 40
DEPT.OF SOCIAL WELFARE — 00075247 — 1F.DISTRICT 03

1A.NYAE.NO.	1B. ADA.NO.	1G.TYPE AGENCY	2.CHILDS LEGAL NAME	3.REFER
7201270203		PUBLIC		NO

CHARACTERISTICS OF-	MOTHER	FATHER	6.PHYSICAL AND EMOTIONAL HEALTH OF FAMILY MEMBERS
4A.NATIONALITY		5A.	
4B.RELIGION	CATHOLIC	5B.CATHOLIC	99
4C.ETHNIC BKGD	WHITE	5C.WHITE	
4D.OCCUPATION		5D.	
4E.BIRTHDATE	/ /	5E. / /	
4F.EDUCATION	YRS.	5F. YRS.	
4G.HEIGHT	FT. IN.	5G. FT. IN.	7.LEGAL STATUS OF CHILD
4H.WEIGHT	LBS.	5H. LBS.	A.ACCEPTED FOR STUDY 03/02/6
4I.HAIR COLOR		5I.	B.CAME UNDER CARE 03/03/6
4J.EYE COLOR		5J.	C.VOL.RELINQ.-FATHER 03/03/6
4K.SKIN COLOR		5K.	D.VOL.RELINQ.-MOTHER 99/99/9
4L.HANDICAP		5L.	E.RIGHTS TERM-MOTHER 04/12/7
			F.RIGHTS TERM-FATHER 04/12/7
			G.CHILD NOT LEGALLY FREE-

CHARACTERISTICS OF CHILD-

9.BIRTHDATE - 06/05/64

10.SEX MALE

11.ETHNIC BKGD. WHITE X
PUERTO RICAN
NEGRO
AMERICAN IND. TRIBE
CHINESE
JAPANESE
FILIPINO
OTHER
SPECIFY

11A.JEWISH BACKGROUND- NO

12.HAIR COLOR BROWN

13.EYE COLOR BROWN

14.SKIN COLOR MEDIUM

15.INTEL.DEV. SLOW

16.BUILD AVERAGE

17.HIGHEST GRADE 03

18.HANDICAP NONE
PHYS.CORRECTABLE
REQ.ATTN
AFF.APPEAR
AFF.FUNC.
EMOT.CORRECTABLE
REQ.ATTN.
AFF.APPEAR
AFF.FUNC.

19.RELIGION PREFERRED - CATHOLIC

20.FAMILY NEEDED - NO RESTRICTION

21.SIBLINGS-PLACED TOGETHER - NO

22.PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT OF CHILD
WITHDRAWN WITH PENT UP EM
OTIONS SHY ACADEMICS I
MPROVING DISCIPLINE PROBL
EM IMPROVING

23.READINESS TEMP NOT PLACEABLE

23B.PERM. NOT PLACEABLE BECAUSE-
1.PHYSICAL
2.MENTAL
3.OTHER

23C.CAREBEING PROVIDED
1.TEMP.FOSTER HOME
2.PERM.FOSTER HOME
3.CARE IN HOSPITAL
4.OTHER INSTITUTION
5.GUARDIAN APPOINTED
6.OTHER
SPECIFY

8.-24. COMMENTS
PERMANENT NEGLECT; CHILD LEGALLY FREE. PARENTS WHE
REABOUTS UNKNOWN.

NOW IN ALBANY HOME FOR CHILDREN FOURTH GRADE
PREPARING FOR EVENTUAL ADOPTIVE PLACEMENT

AGENCY REPRESENTATIVE

DATE SUBMITTED 01/25/72

STATE OF NEW YORK - ADOPTION EXCHANGE CENTER

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

NYSAE REGISTRATION
Adoptive Applicant

1A. NYSAE NUMBER

1B. NAME OF AGENCY

1C. AGENCY CODE

1D. AGENCY CASE NUMBER

1E. AREA OFFICE

1F. TYPE OF AGENCY
1 ☐ PUBLIC 2 ☐ PRIVATE 3 ☐ OUT OF STATE

2A. FAMILY SURNAME

2B. DATE OF MARRIAGE

3. REFER TO ARENA
1 ☐ YES 2 ☐ NO

CHARACTERISTICS OF WIFE

SDSS USE

4A. FIRST NAME

4B. NATIONALITY DESCENT

4C. BIRTHDATE

4D. ETHNIC BACKGROUND

4E. ANNUAL INCOME

4F. OCCUPATION

4G. EDUCATION (YEARS COMPLETED)

4H. RELIGION

4I. HEIGHT

4J. WEIGHT

4K. HAIR COLOR (CHECK ONE BOX)
1 ☐ BROWN 2 ☐ BLACK 3 ☐ BLONDE 4 ☐ RED

4L. EYE COLOR (CHECK ONE BOX)
1 ☐ BROWN 2 ☐ BLUE 3 ☐ GREEN 4 ☐ HAZEL

4M. SKIN COLOR (CHECK ONE BOX)
1 ☐ LIGHT 2 ☐ MEDIUM 3 ☐ DARK

4N. HANDICAP

CHARACTERISTICS OF HUSBAND

SDSS USE

5A. FIRST NAME

5B. NATIONALITY DESCENT

5C. BIRTHDATE

5D. ETHNIC BACKGROUND

5E. ANNUAL INCOME

5F. OCCUPATION

5G. EDUCATION (YEARS COMPLETED)

5H. RELIGION

5I. HEIGHT

5J. WEIGHT

5K. HAIR COLOR (CHECK ONE BOX)
1 ☐ BROWN 2 ☐ BLACK 3 ☐ BLONDE 4 ☐ RED

5L. EYE COLOR (CHECK ONE BOX)
1 ☐ BROWN 2 ☐ BLUE 3 ☐ GREEN 4 ☐ HAZEL

5M. SKIN COLOR (CHECK ONE BOX)
1 ☐ LIGHT 2 ☐ MEDIUM 3 ☐ DARK

5N. HANDICAP

6. PHYSICAL AND EMOTIONAL HEALTH OF FAMILY MEMBERS (INCLUDE HANDICAPS) (Limit - 100 letters and spaces)

7A. APPLICATION STATUS

	MONTH	DAY	YEAR
1. REQUEST TO ADOPT FILED			
2. INTAKE INTERVIEW DATE			
3. SIGNED APPLICATION RECEIVED			
4. HOME STUDY STARTED			
5. HOME APPROVED			

7B.
DELAY REQUESTED 1 ☐ READY FOR PLACEMENT 2 ☐

8A. MAXIMUM DISTANCE APPLICANT WILL TRAVEL
_____ MILES ☐ NOT LIMITED

8B. COMMENTS CONCERNING PROSPECTIVE PARENTS (Limit - 200 letters and spaces)

AGENCY REPRESENTATIVE

DATE

FORM OSS-1583 (REV. 2/79) (FACE)

9. RELIGION CHILD WILL BE REARED — SDSS USE

10. NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN APPLICANT'S HOME (ENTER NUMBER)

11. WILL APPLICANT CONSIDER SIBLINGS
1 ☐ YES 2 ☐ NO

12. MEMBERS OF APPLICANT'S HOUSEHOLD (INCLUDING CHILDREN):

	BIRTHDATE Month	Day	Year	RELATIONSHIP	ETHNIC BACKGROUND
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6.					

CHARACTERISTICS OF CHILD DESIRED

13A. AGE RANGE PREFERRED
From ____ Years ____ Months to ____ Years ____ Months

13B. AGE RANGE ACCEPTABLE — NO PREFERENCE
From ____ Years ____ Months to ____ Years ____ Months

INSTRUCTIONS: *Circle one number in each line to indicate degree of preference: 1 = Request, 2 = Will consider, 3 = Will not accept. In each of these items there is a box to check if there is no preference.*

				NO PREFERENCE
14. SEX ACCEPTABLE:				
1 MALE	1	2	3	
2 FEMALE	1	2	3	
15. HAIR COLOR:				
1 BROWN	1	2	3	
2 BLACK	1	2	3	
3 BLONDE	1	2	3	
4 RED	1	2	3	
16. INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT:				
1 SLOW (See Item 23 Below *)	1	2	3	
2 AVERAGE	1	2	3	
3 ACCELERATED	1	2	3	
20. HANDICAP ACCEPTABLE:				
A. NONE (IF NONE CIRCLE 1) →	1	-	-	
ALSO IF NONE CIRCLE 3'S: →				
B. PHYSICAL:				
(1) CORRECTABLE	1	2	3	
(2) REQUIRING ON-GOING MEDICAL ATTENTION	1	2	3	
(3) AFFECTING APPEARANCE	1	2	3	
(4) AFFECTING SOCIAL OR PHYSICAL FUNCTIONING	1	2	3	
C. EMOTIONAL:				
(1) CORRECTABLE	1	2	3	
(2) REQUIRING ON-GOING MEDICAL ATTENTION	1	2	3	
(3) AFFECTING APPEARANCE	1	2	3	
(4) AFFECTING SOCIAL OR PHYSICAL FUNCTIONING	1	2	3	

				NO PREFERENCE
18. SKIN COLOR:				
1 LIGHT	1	2	3	
2 MEDIUM	1	2	3	
3 DARK	1	2	3	
17. EYE COLOR:				
1 BROWN	1	2	3	
2 BLUE	1	2	3	
3 GREEN	1	2	3	
4 HAZEL	1	2	3	
19. BUILD DESIRED:				
1 SHORT	1	2	3	
2 AVERAGE	1	2	3	
3 TALL	1	2	3	
21. ETHNIC BACKGROUND:				
1 WHITE	1	2	3	
2 PUERTO RICAN	1	2	3	
3 NEGRO	1	2	3	
4 AMERICAN INDIAN	1	2	3	
(STATE TRIBE) ____				
5 CHINESE	1	2	3	
6 JAPANESE	1	2	3	
7 FILIPINO	1	2	3	
8 OTHER	1	2	3	
(SPECIFY) ____				
9 JEWISH	1	2		

22. NATIONALITY: (IF PREFERENCE, SPECIFY) — NO PREFERENCE — SDSS USE

23. * If "SLOW" is checked under Intellectual Development as 1 (request) or 2 (will consider), please check one of the following.

A ☐ Will NOT accept a retarded child. (Clarify Below)
B Degree of Retardation Acceptable to the Family
1 ☐ Mild - Potential for significant independent functioning when appropriate education and training is provided.
2 ☐ Moderate - Self-care is a realistic goal although a sheltered environment will always be needed.
3 ☐ Severe - Very limited capacity for independent functioning, feeble intellectual ability, poor motor control, and speech problems.
4 ☐ Profound - Needs constant care and supervision.

OTHER COMMENTS: (Limit - 150 letters and spaces)

STATE OF NEW YORK — NYSAE REGISTRATION RECEIPT-APPLICANT — 1D.AGENCY 6K
DEPT.OF SOCIAL SERVICES — 00075247 — 1E.DISTRICT 6

1A.NYSAE NO.	1F.TYPE OF AGENCY	2A.SURNAME	2B.DATE-MARRIAGE	3.REFER-ARENA
750825001	PRIVATE		09/16/61	YES

CHARACTERISTICS OF	- WIFE	- HUSBAND	6.PHYSICAL AND EMOTIONAL HEALTH OF FAMILY MEMBERS
4A.FIRST NAME		5A.	
4B.NATIONALITY	AMERICAN	5B.AMERICAN	BOTH IN EXCELLENT HEALTH
4C.BIRTHDATE	12/23/41	5C.11/02/39	
4D.ETHNIC BKGD	BLACK	5D.BLACK	
4E.INCOME	$07548	5E.$11960	
4F.OCCUPATION	CER DENT ASSTN	5F.CRANE OPERATOR	
4G.EDUCATION	12 YRS.	5G.12 YRS.	7A.APPLICATION STATUS
4H.RELIGION	PROTESTANT	5H.PROTESTANT	
4I.HEIGHT	5 FT.00IN.	5I.5 FT.09 IN.	1.REQUEST TO ADOPT 04/08/7
4J.WEIGHT	175 LBS.	5J.145 LBS.	2.INTAKE INTERVIEW 05/13/7
4K.HAIR COLOR	BLACK	5K.BLACK	3.SIGNED APP.RECVD 05/21/7
4L.EYE COLOR	BROWN	5L.BROWN	4.HOME STUDY STARTED 06/02/7
4M.SKIN COLOR	LIGHT	5M.MEDIUM	5.HOME APPROVED 07/31/7
4N.HANDICAP, IF ANY	NONE	5N.NONE	7B.DELAY REQUESTED-NO

8A.MAX.DISTANCE	9.RELIGION TO BE REARED	10.NO.CHILDREN	11.CONSIDER SIBLINGS
NOT LIMITED	PROTESTANT	00	NO

12.OTHERS IN APPLICANTS HOME

	BIRTHDATE	RELATIONSHIP	ETHNIC BKGD.
1.	99/99/99	99	99
2.	99/99/99	99	99
3.	99/99/99	99	99
4.	99/99/99	99	99
5.	99/99/99	99	99
6.	99/99/99	99	99

88.-23.COMMENTS
UNABLE TO CONCEIVE OWN CHILD HAVE REALISTIC SENSITIVE OUTLOOK ON A PTIVE PARENTHOOD
QUIET RE RVED COUPLE CAN PROVIDE STIMULATI LOVE AND WARMTH

CHARACTERISTICS DESIRED IN CHILD

13A.AGE-PREFERRED 00 YRS.00 MOS.-00 YRS.07MOS.
ACCEPTABLE 00 YRS.00 MOS.-01 YRS.00MOS.

14.SEX-MALE	2	20.HANDICAP-NONE	1		
FEMALE	1	PHYS.-CORRECTABLE	3	EMOT.-CORRECTABLE	3
15.SKIN-LIGHT	2	REQ.ATTN.	3	REQ.ATTN.	3
MEDIUM	1	AFF.APPEAR.	3	AFF.APPEAR.	3
DARK	2	AFF.FUNCT.	3	AFF.FUNCT.	3
16.HAIR-BROWN	2				
BLACK	2				
BLONDE	3	21.ETHNIC BKGD.-WHITE	3		
RED	2	PUERTO RICAN	3		
17.EYES-BROWN	2	NEGRO	1		
BLUE	2	AMER.INDIAN	2		
GREEN	2	TRIBE			
HAZEL	2	CHINESE	3		
18.INT.DEV.-SLOW	2	JAPANESE	3		
AVERAGE	2	FILIPINO	3		
ACCEL.	2	OTHER	3		
19.BUILD- SHORT	2	SPECIFY			
AVERAGE	2	JEWISH	3		
TALL	2				

22.NATIONALITY-NO PREFERENCE

AGENCY REPRESENTATIVE

DATE SUBMITTED 06/04/75

APPENDIX H

Computer Generated Referral

NYSAE POSSIBLE REFERRAL
08/04/75

AGENCY 6Y

NAME

-----ADOPTIVE CHILD-----
NYSAE NO. 7211240242
ADA NO.

--- CHARACTERISTICS OF NATURAL PARENTS ---

	MOTHER	FATHER
NATIONALITY	AMERICAN	AMERICAN
RELIGION	R C	R C
ETHNIC BKGD.	PUERTO RICAN	PUERTO RICAN
OCCUPATION	UNK	UNK
BIRTHDATE	00/00/36	10/01/39
EDUCATION	08 YRS.	YRS.
HEIGHT	5 FT.00 IN.	5 FT.08 IN.
WEIGHT	LBS.	LBS.
HAIR COLOR	BROWN	BROWN
EYE COLOR	UNK.	HAZEL
SKIN COLOR	LIGHT	MED.
HANDICAP		

PHYS.& EMOT.HEALTH OF FAMILY MEMBERS

RELIGION PREF.=
CATHOLIC

FAMILY NEEDED=
NO RESTRICTIONS

SIBS.TOGETHER-YES

--- CHARACTERISTICS OF CHILD ---

BIRTHDATE 12/09/67
SEX MALE
ETHNIC BKGD.=
WHITE
PUER RIC X
NEGRO
INDIAN
TRIBE
CHINESE
JAPANESE
FILIPINO
OTHER
SPECIFY
JEWISH

HAIR COLOR BLACK
EYE COLOR BROWN
SKIN COLOR MED.
INTEL.DEV. AVERAGE
BUILD AVERAGE
HIGHEST GRADE
HANDICAP= NONE
PHYS.CORRECTABLE
REQS.ATTN.
AFF.APPEAR.
AFF.FUNC.
EMOT.CORRECTABLE X
REQS.ATTN.
AFF.APPEAR.
AFF.FUNC.

-- LEGAL STATUS OF CHILD --- PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT --
-- OF CHILD --

ACCEPTED FOR STUDY 99/99/99
CAME UNDER CARE 99/99/99
VOL.RELINQ.-FATHER 99/99/99
VOL.RELINQ.-MOTHER 99/99/99
RIGHTS TERM.MOTHER 10/14/71
RIGHTS TERM.FATHER 99/99/99
CHILD NOT LEGALLY FREE -

HYPERACTIVE ALWAYS WITH B
ROTHER ADJUSTS FIRM CONSI
STENT DISCIPLINE.

COMMENTS

ROBUST WELL DEVELOPED WELL NOURISHED ALWAYS IN HOM
E WITH BROTHER SPEAKS SPANISH & ENGLISH.

AGENCY REPRESENTATIVE

DATE SUBMITTED
11/10/72

------ADOPTIVE APPLICANT------ AGENCY 6H6

SURNAME- NYSAL NO. 750410005

DATE OF MARRIAGE 11/12/66

----- CHARACTERISTICS OF APPLICANTS -----	WIFE	HUSBAND	PHYS.& EMOT.HEALTH OF FAMILY MEMBERS
FIRST NAME			
NATIONALITY	USA	USA	WARM EMOTIONALL
BIRTHDATE	07/11/44	08/17/46	Y STABLE C
ETHNIC BKGD.	NEGRO	NEGRO	OUPLE PHYSICAL
INCOME	$ 7,656	$ 9,568	HEALTH EXCELLEN
OCCUPATION	ACCOUNTS RECEI	CHARTIST	T
EDUCATION	13 YRS.	14 YRS.	
RELIGION	P	P	
HEIGHT	5 FT.07 IN.	6 FT.01 IN.	
WEIGHT	129 LBS.	193 LBS.	REL.TO BE REARED-
HAIR COLOR	BLACK	BROWN	PROTESTANT
EYE COLOR	BROWN	BROWN	NO.CHILDREN IN HOME-
SKIN COLOR	MED.	MED.	00
HANDICAP	NONE	NONE	CONSIDER SIBLINGS-
			YES

----- CHARACTERISTICS OF CHILD DESIRED -----

AGE PREF.-00 YRS.01 MOS.- INTEL.DEV.-SLOW 3 ETHNIC BKGD.-
08 YRS.00 MOS. AVERAGE 1 WHITE 3
ACCEPT.-00 YRS.01 MOS.- ACCELERATED 2 PUER RIC 2
08 YRS.00 MOS. BUILD-SHORT 2 NEGRO 1
SEX-MALE 1 AVERAGE 1 INDIAN 3
FEMALE 1 TALL 2 TRIBE-

SKIN COLOR-LIGHT 2 HANDICAP-
MEDIUM 1 NONE 2 CHINESE 3
DARK 2 PHYS.CORRECTABLE 1 JAPANESE 3
HAIR COLOR-BROWN 1 REQS.ATTN. 3 FILIPINO 3
BLACK 1 AFF.APPEAR. 3 OTHER 3
BLONDE 3 AFF.FUNC. 3 SPECIFY-
RED 3 EMOT.CORRECTABLE 1
EYE COLOR- BROWN 1 REQS.ATTN. 3 JEWISH 3
BLUE 2 AFF.APPEAR. 3
GREEN 2 AFF.FUNC. 3
HAZEL 2 NATIONALITY-BLACK

--- APPLICATION STATUS ---

----- OTHERS IN APPLICANTS HOME -----

BIRTHDATE	RELATIONSHIP	ETHNIC BKGD.
99/99/99	99	99
99/99/99	99	99
99/99/99	99	99
99/99/99	99	99
99/99/99	99	99
99/99/99	99	99

REQ.FILED 10/09/73
INTERVIEW 10/16/73
APP.RECVD. 10/25/73
HOME STUDY 10/16/73
HOME APRVD. 02/05/74

DELAY REQUESTED-NO
MAX.DIST.-NOT LIMITED

COMMENTS

ATTRACTIVE MRS FREINDLY AND ARTICULATE MR OP
EN AND FRANK OFTEN VERBAL GOOD INTERACTION GOOD

PREFER SIBLINGS MF FF MM IN GOOD PHYSICAL AND EMO
TIONAL HEALTH

AGENCY REPRESENTATIVE DATE SUBMITTED 03/14/75 SOSS CODE 0742

APPENDIX I

New York State Adoption Exchange Statistical Report on Child and Family Registrations October 1974

Quarterly Report

			Total
1.	Registrations		
	A. Children		2087
	1. Ready for Placement	944	
	2. Temporarily Not Placeable	437	
	3. Permanently Not Placeable	706	
	B. Families		1265

A. Boys Ready for Placement - 562

	ETHNIC BACKGROUND						
Age	W	W/B	W/PR	B/PR	B	Other	Total
0-1 yrs.		2					2
2-3 yrs.	4			1	6		11
4-5 yrs.	19	2	3	4	31		55
6-7 yrs.	17	6	2	3	82	3	114
8-10 yrs.	28	17	6	1	125	4	183
11-13 yrs.	41	8	1		75	4	130
14 and over	29	3	2		31	2	67
Total	138	38	14	9	350	13	562
Intellect							
Slow	71	13	8	6	62	3	163
Average	56	18	5	3	248	8	338
Accelerated	4	5	1		27	2	39
Unknown	7	2			13		22
Total	138	38	14	9	350	13	562
Religion							
Protestant	41	12	1	2	268	2	326
Jewish	5						5
Catholic	58	16	11	7	24	9	125
Other							
No Preference	34	10	2		58	2	106
Total	138	38	14	9	350	13	562
Length of Time Registered							
0-3 months.	7	2	4	6	13	1	33
4-6 months.	16	4	1		8		29
7-12 months.	16	4	1	1	27	4	53
13-24 months.	35	8	2	2	65	2	114
25 and up.	64	20	6		237	6	333
Total	138	38	14	9	350	13	562

Handicapped	White	Non White		White	Non White
1 year or less	0	0			
2-3 years	3	2	8-10 years	21	51
4-5 years	16	18	11-13 years	31	32
6-7 years	12	24	14 years and up.	14	19
Sub Total	31	44	Sub Total	66	102
			Total	97	146

B. Girls - 382

1. Age

	ETHNIC BACKGROUND						
	W	W/B	W/PR	B/PR	B	Other	Total
0-1 yrs.		1					1
2-3 yrs.	6	1			4		11
4-5 yrs.	12	2	1	1	20		36
6-7 yrs.	4		1		42		47
8-10 yrs.	19	8		1	94		122
11-13 yrs.	30	7	4		66	3	110
14 yrs. and over	25	2	2		25	1	55
Total	96	21	8	2	251	4	382

2. Intellect

Slow	48	6	2	2	44	1	103
Average	40	14	5		172	3	234
Accelerated	3	1			32		36
Unknown	5		1		3		9
Total	96	21	8	2	251	4	382

3. Religion

Protestant	42	8	1		195	2	248
Jewish	2						2
Catholic	33	11	7	2	12	2	67
Other	1						1
No Preference	18	2			44		64
Total	96	21	8	2	251	4	382

4. Length of time Registered

0-3 months	5	1		1	15		22
4-6 months	14	2	2		9		27
7-12 months	11				22	1	34
13-24 months	15	6	3	1	48	1	74
25 and up	51	12	3		157	2	225
Total	96	21	8	2	251	4	382

5. Handicapped

	White	Non White	
1 yr or less			
2-3 yrs.	6	2	8
4-5 yrs.	11	12	23
6-7 yrs.	4	9	13
8-10 yrs.	9	27	36
11-13 yrs.	12	16	28
14 and up	10	10	20
Total	52	76	108

Children - Temporarily Not Placeable Total - 437

C. Boys - 268

1. Age	ETHNIC BACKGROUND W	W/B	W/PR	B/PR	B	Other	Total
0-1 yrs.	1				1		2
2-3 yrs.	4	2			1		7
4-5 yrs.	4				8	2	14
6-7 yrs.	10	2		2	19	1	34
8-10 yrs.	27	3	2		43	3	78
11-13 yrs.	35	8	5	1	32	5	86
14 yrs. & over	24	6	1		16		47
Total	105	21	8	3	120	11	268
2. Intellect							
Slow	42	6	3	1	28	1	81
Average	60	8	4	2	80	10	164
Accelerated	1	6	1		7		15
Unknown	2	1			5		8
Total	105	21	8	3	120	11	268
3. Religion							
Protestant	47	6	1		88	3	145
Jewish	1						1
Catholic	38	9	7	1	10	6	71
Other							
No Preference	19	6		2	22	2	51
Total	105	21	8	3	120	11	268
4. Length of Time Registered							
0-3 months	3		2		1		6
4-6 months	5	1			2	2	10
7-12 mo.	11	3	2		9		25
13-24 mo.	23	5	1	1	29	1	60
25 months & over	63	12	3	2	79	8	167
Total	105	21	8	3	120	11	268

5. Handicapped	White	Non White	
1 yr. or less	1		1
2-3 yrs.	3	1	4
4-5 yrs.	4	1	5
6-7 yrs.	5	11	16
8-10 yrs.	19	24	43
11-13 yrs.	24	20	44
14 and up	17	8	25
Total	73	65	138

Temporarily Not Placeable (continued)

D. Girls - 169

1. Age	ETHNIC BACKGROUND						
	W	W/B	W/PR	B/PR	B	Other	Total
0-1 yr.	3						3
2-3 yr.	2				2		4
4-5 yr.	6	1			4		11
6-7 yr.	12	1		2	10	1	26
8-10 yr.	12	11	2		21	2	48
11-13 yr.	13	4		1	24	3	45
14 yrs. & over	11	4			16	1	32
Total	59	21	2	3	77	7	169
2. Intellect							
Slow	20	5			19		44
Average	32	15	2	2	50	7	108
Accelerated	1	1		1	7		10
Unknown	6				1		7
Total	59	21	2	3	77	7	169
3. Religion							
Protestant	19	4		3	58	2	86
Jewish	1						1
Catholic	23	10	2		9	5	49
Other							
No Preference	16	7			10		33
Total	59	21	2	3	77	7	169
4. Length of Time Registered							
0-3 months	2	1			2	1	6
4-6 months	4					1	5
7-12 mo.	6	3	1		4	1	15
13-24 mo.	9	2	1	3	23	1	39
25 mo. and over	38	15			48	3	104
Total	59	21	2	3	77	7	168

5. Handicapped	White	Non White	
1 yr. or less	1		1
2-3 yrs.	4	1	5
4-5 yrs.	5	2	7
6-7 yrs.	10	5	15
8-10 yrs.	10	9	19
11-13 yrs.	9	13	22
14 and up	4	8	12
Total	43	38	81

Children Permanently Not Placeable Total - 706

E. Boys - 418

1. Age

	ETHNIC BACKGROUND						
	W	W/B	W/PR	B/PR	B	Other	Total
0-1 yrs.	1						1
2-3 yrs.	5				1		6
4-5 yrs.	19	1			2		22
6-7 yrs.	17	2	1		9		29
8-10 yrs.	35	2	2	1	51	1	92
11-13 yrs.	40	8	3		47	1	99
14 yrs. and over	65	10	6		81	7	169
Total	182	23	12	1	191	9	418

2. Intellect

Slow	119	10	6		63	4	202
Average	47	12	5	1	117	5	187
Accelerated	11	1	1		7		20
Unknown	5				4		9
Total	182	23	12	1	191	9	418

3. Religion

Protestant	74	13	5	1	144	3	240
Jewish	6		1				7
Catholic	66	8	6		7	5	92
Other							
No Preference	36	2			39	1	78
Total	182	23	12	1	191	9	418

4. Length of Time Registered

0-3 months	1	1			1		3
4-6 months	3						3
7-12 months	10				2		12
13-24 months	27	4	1		35	2	69
25 mo. and over	141	18	11	1	153	7	331
Total	182	23	12	1	191	9	418

5. Handicapped

	White	Non White	
1 yr. or less	1		1
2-3 yrs.	5	1	6
4-5 yrs.	18	2	20
6-7 yrs.	17	7	24
8-10 yrs.	29	30	59
11-13 yrs.	41	24	65
14 and over	45	51	96
Total	156	115	271

F. Girls - 288

1. Age

	ETHNIC BACKGROUND						
	W	W/B	W/PR	B/PR	B	Other	Total
0-1 yrs.							
2-3 yrs.	3	1					4
4-5 yrs.	4	1	1		5		11
6-7 yrs.	13		1		11		25
8-10 yrs.	16	1			25	1	43
11-13 yrs.	27	9	3		50	5	94
14 yrs. & over	42	8	3	1	55	2	111
Total	105	20	8	1	146	8	288

2. Intellect

Slow	73	6	3	1	35	4	122
Average	25	12	4		96	4	141
Accelerated	5	2			15		22
Unknown	2		1				3
Total	105	20	8	1	146	8	288

3. Religion

Protestant	42	10	2		114	1	169
Jewish	4				2		6
Catholic	41	8	6	1	7	6	69
Other	1						
No Preference	17	2			23	1	43
Total	105	20	8	1	146	8	288

4. Length of Time Registered

0-3 months		1			3		4
4-6 months	3	1					4
7-12 months	5				7		12
13-24 mo.	14	2	2		31	1	50
25 mo. & over	83	16	6	1	105	7	218
Total	105	20	8	1	146	8	288

5. Handicapped

	White	Non White	
1 year or less			
2-3 years	3	1	4
4-5 years	3	7	10
6-7 years	13	6	19
8-10 years	15	9	24
11-13 years	18	26	44
14 and up	21	24	45
Total	73	73	146

II Characteristics of Adoptive Applicants Registered on the New York State Adoption Exchange

Total Number on the Computer File 1265

A. Age	Total	Male	Female
24 years or less	31	5	26
25-28 years	326	115	211
29-35 years	1,247	584	663
36-40 years	489	291	198
41-50 years	333	194	139
51 years and over	58	32	14
Unknown	58	44	14

B. Ethnic Background			
White	2,340	1,155	1,185
White/Black	1		1
White/Puerto Rican	1	1	
Black/Puerto Rican	2	1	1
Black	64	30	34
Puerto Rican	5	3	2
All Others	117	75	42

C. Length of Marriage			
2 years or less	160	80	80
3-5 years	226	113	113
6-9 years	930	465	465
10 years or over	1,210	605	605
Total	2,526	1,263	1,263

III Preferences of Adoptive Families

A. Age Group	Preferred	Acceptable
1 year or less	677	473
2 years or less	177	219
3 years or less	131	168
4 years or less	86	126
5 years or less	192	277
No Preference		
Unknown		

B. Sex	
Male	412
Female	558
No Preference	587

C. Intellectual Development	
Slow	236
Average	1078
Accelerated	954
No Preference	177

D. Handicap

Families preferring a child without a handicap	1,255
Families willing to consider the following kinds of handicap.	
Physical-Correctable	842
Physical-Ongoing Medical Care	305
Physical-Affects Appearance	184
Physical-Affects functioning	114
Emotional-Correctable	418
Emotional-Ongoing Medical Care	191
Emotional-Affects Appearance	116
Emotional-Affects Functioning	105
No Preference	4

E. Ethnic Background

Families who prefer or will consider children with the following ethnic background.

White	1192	Other	1061
Black	56	No Preference	
Puerto Rican	231		
Indian	329		

APPENDIX J

Sample Page of Monthly Listings of New York State Adoption Exchange

May

Monthly Listing of Child Registrations with
State Adoption Exchange

1. Childs initials O.A. Sex F. DOB 7-7-73 Religion Protestant

Exchange Reg. No. 750501001 Ethnic Background Black

Agency Plan: [X] Ready for Placement [ ] Temporarily not Placeable

[ ] Permanently not Placeable Health No Health problems

Growth and Development She was born prematurely and is functioning below grade level.

Personality/Social Adjustment She is an alert responsive child but is shy with strangers.

For information contact _____

---

2. Childs initials J. H. Sex M DOB 2-23-69 Religion Protestant

Exchange Reg. No. 750519011 Ethnic Background Black

Agency Plan: [X] Ready for Placement [ ] Temporarily not Placeable

[ ] Permanently not Placeable Health Physical health good

Growth and Development A moderately retarded child, he has shown ability to change and grow in a motivated and structural environment.

Personality/Social Adjustment Initially he is withdrawn and anxious to be accepted but blossoms in a secure environment. He is verbal and plays well with other children.

For information contact _____

---

3. Childs initials T.S. Sex F DOB 4-21-74 Religion No Preference

Exchange Reg. No. 750519012 Ethnic Background White

Agency Plan: [ ] Ready for Placement [ ] Temporarily not Placeable

[X] Permanently not Placeable Health Poor

Growth and Development She is a microcephalic child with a birth injury.

Personality/Social Adjustment She is diagnosed as severely retarded.

For information contact _____

---

4. Childs initials T. B. Sex F DOB 3-2-72 Religion Catholic

Exchange Reg. No. 750519013-1 Ethnic Background White

Agency Plan: [X] Ready for Placement [ ] Temporarily not Placeable

[ ] Permanently not Placeable Health No Problems

Growth and Development Care in own home lacked warmth and affection.

Personality/Social Adjustment She has learned to give and recieve affection and play well with other children in the foster home. She must be placed with her sister.

For information contact _____

APPENDIX K

"You-Me"

April - May, 1975

RICHARD and **ANN MARIE** are brother and sister, and should be placed together.

Eight years old, Richard is a healthy third-grader who is adjusting well to his foster home. He needs understanding parents because of early deprivation.

Ann Marie is usually agreeable and tries hard to make a good impression. She needs a home with firmness. Ann Marie is in good health, nine years old and in the fifth grade.

CHRISTOPHER has Down's Syndrome but has made excellent progress in the special school he attends. Four years old, he has a limited vocabulary and follows directions well. He enjoys simple games and participates enthusiastically. Generally in good health, Christopher is happy and affectionate.

Eleven-year-old **LORRAINE** enjoys music, bicycle riding and sports. She relates better to younger children than to those her own age. Lorraine is an enjoyable child who smiles often. She appears to have been emotionally deprived and would benefit from adoptive parents who can give her a feeling of security.

These youngsters are available for adoption.

You Me

Children for Your Heart and Home...

Children featured in this newsletter have been registered with the State Adoption Exchange by local public and private adoption agencies in New York State.

Photo Courtesy International Telephone and Telegraph Corp.

For more information,
contact the
New York State
Department of
Social Services,
1450 Western Avenue,
Albany, N.Y. 12243
Adoption Exchange Center
Tel: (518) 457-1942

April-May 1975

Ten years old, **KEITH** has serious hearing loss and cerebral palsy. He walks fairly well with braces. Keith is alert and communicates well with pantomime. In the third grade of a school for the deaf, he is self-confident and has imagination and initiative.

KIMBERLY, almost eleven years old, suffers from cerebral palsy, which makes walking difficult for her. She gets along well with people in her special class at school and in her foster home. Kimberly enjoys animals, fishing, swimming and picnics. She has a pleasing personality, and her health is otherwise good.

Although **ROBERT** has some emotional and behavioral problems, these could be cured in a stable home with relaxed parents able to give him much love and attention. Robert is 12 years old, generally in good health, and is making progress academically.

EDDIE is friendly, happy and sociable. Six years old, he has cerebral palsy although physicians feel he will be able to walk. He is interested in boy-type games, and he enjoys playing soldier and looking at books.

APPENDIX L

Footnotes For Other

Adoption Exchanges and Listing Services

Table

(1) DHEW Publication No. (SRS) 75-03258

Children served by Public Welfare Agencies and voluntary Child Welfare agencies and institutions. March, 1971.

Data from Table 8 - Children receiving social services from public welfare agencies and voluntary child welfare agencies and institutions by living arrangement. Number in foster family homes or group homes plus number in institutions.

(2) DHEW Pulication No. (SRS) 75-03259 Adoption in 1972, Table 4, Children adopted by unrelated petitioners by type of placement. Total agency placements.

(3) DHEW Publication No. (SRS) 73-03259 Adoption in 1971, Table 4, Children adopted by unrelated petitioners by type of placement. Total agency placements.

(4) Not all withdrawals are adoptions. Some children reach majority, die, are institutionalized, etc. Not all placements are through the listing.

(5) Estimated on basis of information supplied by each Exchange or Listing Servic

(6) Data from New York City Special Services for Children for 1971.

Board of Directors

Isaac Alcabes
SUNY at Buffalo

Joseph J. Barbaro
Catholic Charities

Stephen Berger
New York University

Joyce M. Black
Day Care Council of New York, Inc.

Barbara Blum
New York State Department of Social Services

James Dumpson
New York Community Trust

David Fanshel
Columbia University, School of Social Work

Arne E. Heggen
Carola, Doran, Grogan & Heggen

Charlotte Holstein
New York State Association for Human Services, Inc.

Felix Infausto
New York State Department of Social Services (Retired)

Shirley Jenkins
Columbia University, School of Social Work

John J. Keppler
New York Community Trust (Retired)

George Klein
Barton's Candy Corporation

David Lopez
Puerto Rican Association of Community Affairs, Inc.

Frank Macchiarola
City University of New York, Graduate School

Hugh O'Neill
New York State Department of Social Services

Bernard Shapiro
New York State Board of Social Welfare

Rabbi Morris Sherer
Agudath Israel of America

Rev. Joseph M. Sullivan
Brooklyn Catholic Charities

Clifford Talcott
New York State Department of Social Services (Retired)

Herbert Tenzer
Tenzer, Greenblat, Fallon & Kaplan

Philip L. Toia
New York City Deputy Mayor for Finance

Joseph Weber
The Greater New York Fund

Herbert B. West
New York Community Trust

Peter Wynn
New York State Department of Social Services